

Austin, Tex., favoring appropriation for National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1509. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Reclamation Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing J. LEROY JOHNSON to the House Committee on Flood Control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1510. Also, petition of the Ironwood Chamber of Commerce, Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1511. Also petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. Also, petition of the Pan American Union, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Pan American Day; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Horace E. Cromer, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Spiritual Father to all men, Arbiter of the destiny of the nations of the whole earth, it is just and needful that we renew with each new dawn our allegiance to Thee and to Thy will. This we pause to do. We seek Thy guidance, Thy way, and Thy purposes for this day. Make us to know that which is right in Thy sight.

Let the blessing of our Father God rest on each of us here assembled, all those whom we represent, the men of our far-flung national forces, the leaders of the nations, and all men. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Caraway	Hatch
Andrews	Chandler	Hawkes
Austin	Chavez	Hayden
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Ball	Connally	Holman
Bankhead	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Barbour	Davis	La Follette
Bilbo	Eastland	Langer
Bone	Ellender	Lodge
Brewster	Ferguson	Lucas
Bridges	George	McCarran
Buck	Gerry	McClellan
Burton	Gillette	McFarland
Bushfield	Green	McKellar
Byrd	Guffey	McNary
Capper	Gurney	Maloney

Meybank	Revercomb	Vandenberg
Mead	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Millikin	Russell	Wallgren
Moore	Scruggam	Walsh
Murdoch	Shipstead	Wheeler
Murray	Smith	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Pepper	Tobey	
Radcliffe	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$17,285,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS OR INVENTIONS BY PERSONNEL OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS PERTAINING TO COMPENSATION, AND SO FORTH

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

MARCH 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of March 1943, relating to loan and other authorizations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Congress), a summary table of reports for the month of April 1943 (including all replies received in the Commission through May 29, 1943) submitted by the various executive departments and agencies; also a separate list of those agencies from which no reports, or from which only partial or incomplete reports were received (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BILBO:

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, of Inman, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 159. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Company, of Cleveland, Ohio; with amendments (Rept. No. 301), and

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickords; without amendment (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Edward Gilham; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304); and

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of John Henry Miller, Junior; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; with amendments (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio; without amendment (Rept. No. 306).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion for temporary service, sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve for appointment in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of law, and sundry citizens and a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1217. A bill to equalize the pay and allowances of retired naval officers employed on active duty in the rank of rear admiral with those of rear admirals on the active list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 1218. A bill to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. L. 984), and the act of June 15, 1935, supplementary thereto (49 Stat. L. 378), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1219. A bill to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 95, line 11, after the figures "\$421,039", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of the appropriation authorized under this item shall be used except for the complete liquidation of the resettlement projects which shall be accomplished by December 31, 1943.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE SOLID FUEL INSTITUTE OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Great Need of Mankind—Cooperation," delivered by him before the Solid Fuel Institute of Milwaukee on June 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BERLE TO GRADUATING CLASS OF UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of

State Hon. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., to the graduating class of Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah, May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRATEGY OF THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY CLIFFORD B. WARD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the strategy of the United Nations written by Clifford B. Ward and published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHUS DANIELS FROM TACOMA (WASH.) NEWS-TRIBUNE

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Newspaper Sage" from the Tacoma News-Tribune of June 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle of Washington," by Jay Franklin, printed in the June 1943 issue of the Railroad Trainman, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES—ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. CROWSON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address on railroad freight rates delivered by George M. Crowson, assistant to the president, Illinois Central System, before the Traffic Club of New Orleans, on May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BITUMINOUS-COAL PRODUCTION IN WEST VIRGINIA

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "West Virginia May Set Record in Coal Output," from the Washington Evening Star of June 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASED ALLOTMENTS TO DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 6, 1943, on the subject of increased allotments to dependents of enlisted men in the armed services, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF GASOLINE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to voice the protest of the people of Indiana and of adjoining States against the enforcement of additional restrictions in that area on the use of gasoline for essential purposes. I am prompted to do this by the great volume of protests which have come to me, and I desire to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the names of some of those who have sent the protests, to indicate the character of the men and the businesses they represent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Frederick M. Sutter, Columbus, Ind.
Powell Chevrolet, Inc., Columbus, Ind.
McKibben & Merrill, Terre Haute, Ind.
Dr. D. G. Walesby, Indianapolis, Ind.
W. A. Oeffler, president, Jasonville Industrial Bureau, Jasonville, Ind.

Bruce C. Kixmiller, Inc., Vincennes, Ind.
Harry R. Baldwin, Anderson, Ind.
Clapp Motor Sales, Jeffersonville, Ind.
Hermann C. Wolff, Indianapolis, Ind.
Webster Cafe, Monticello, Ind.

Lowell L. Martin and Will Thomas, La Fayette, Ind.

William J. Duncan, Samuel C. Ennis, Harry B. Sanger, Harry Folk, Thor Kolle, William N. Lave, Harold G. Muenich, and Gertrude Labahn, Hammond, Ind.

Harold E. Laufer, president, St. Joseph Valley Bank, Elkhart, Ind.

James H. Bryant, Vincennes, Ind.

Paul Steem, Nathan Reiff, William Welch, Ivan F. Goodrich, Otis B. Fields, Ted L. Forney, Simon Koontz, Jr., Theodore A. Reitz, Clarence F. Leist, and Clifford P. Martin, Elkhart, Ind.

Wilcox Motor Sales, Jeffersonville, Ind.

Vorgang Motor Sales Co., Jeffersonville, Ind.
Jeffersonville Board of Trade, Jeffersonville, Ind.

Evansville Automobile Dealers Association, J. E. O'Daniel, president, Evansville, Ind.
Osborn Bros. Garage, Jeffersonville, Ind.

William May, S. N. A. & Gravel Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

Indiana Independent Petroleum Association, Indianapolis, Ind.

Bill Nichold, president, South Bend and Mishawaka Auto Trade Association, South Bend, Ind.

Automobile Club Service Bureau, Joseph L. Asay, American Assurance Corporation, Clyde Baugh & Co., P. W. Burns, Citizens Trust & Savings Bank, Commercial Agency, Inc., John W. Cook, Arthur Deitsch, E. J. Eisterhold, Fred Englehart, Franklin Bank & Trust Co., Greene & Green, Harris & Wade, Heyns Insurance Agency, Eli G. Huber, J. C. Futchinson, Interstate Finance Corporation, Kattman Insurance Agency, Kinkle Realty & Insurance Co., Sylvester Krock, Levi Bros., Percy C. Logsdon, Fritz Long, Lukens & Sons, McCoy Realty & Insurance Co., McReynolds & Dreier, Harry R. Miles Insurance Agency, Arthur C. Miller, George O. Miller, W. J. Muenstermann, North Side Insurance Agency, Ole H. Olson, Richard J. Peters, Richardt Agency, Inc., Bernard Schenk, Bayard V. Somes, Southern Commercial Agency, George H. Stockwell Agency, Strassweg Insurance Agency, Torian Insurance Agency, Walker Insurance Agency, A. M. Weil & Bros. Co., Werner Realty & Insurance Co., D. Ed Williams, William R. Woods, West Side Insurance Agency, West Side Investment Co., Evansville, Ind.

Lorraine Boerger, Kenneth Beard, Walter Binder, Richard Blitz, Herman Bohnke, Henry Branning, Florence Brower, John Wolfrum, Henry Curdes, Vilas Feasel, George Fishing, Leo Weber, Irma Hartman, John Hartwig, Raymond Hawver, Paul Hess, Al Hoffman, David Hostetter, Hamilton Hunter, Walter Keeberg, Frank Lahmeyer, Effie Lucas, Walter Lupke, Clem Mettler, Miller & Lawry, Vern Mitchell, William Moellering, Fred Niemeyer, Harry Geoglein, Eugene Pequignot, Alfred Randall, Walter Rosenwinkel, Schaaf & Auer, William Scheiman, Henry Schoppman, Earl Seibold, Frieda Colditz, Paul Spear, Ralph Stogdill, Ray Kuhn, Willard Thomas, Joseph Till, William VonDreau, Fred Wiedemann, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Southeastern Indiana Division of Cincinnati Automobile Club, Cincinnati, Ohio.

S. T. Berner, W. H. Bruner, Clifford Fletcher, Alexis Coquillard, J. W. Montgomery, Carl W. Ginz, Eugene Happ, Stanley J. Muszynski, Joseph Neff, Clarence Haas, C. E. Perins, Russel E. Smith, F. L. Nelson, Arthur P. Perley, W. S. Phillips, Paul Shanahan, C. Mont Smith, J. Harold Keracof, Walter Stoner, George E. Keller, Dean Swadner, Fred J. Huns, Marvin Mogle, A. J. Schindler, Regis Richard, Roy E. Rohleder, South Bend, Ind.
A. L. Anchors, Guy S. Ayers, Leslie Bain, David Furse, A. N. Blank, Emma Claus, M. A.

Braman, J. S. Brown, Forest S. Briggs, Thomas J. Welch, Theodore H. Dauer, Caroline Darfos, Edward Flannery, William F. Funke, Mary Kent, T. M. Kitchen, Annabelle H. Huffin, Kenneth McLennan, Harry Hall, Paul Christy, Edward Jakoby, Fred Jannasch, Tyrie Robbins, Wm. Glover, Milo Vale, Gus Kravis, Al Krueger, Alex. Lyris, Julius Mathies, Ralph Patchter, J. A. Oberdorfer, Walter Pickett, Ralph Rhoades, George Rogge, Wm. Schmidt, John Schneider, E. C. Simpson, F. M. Sopcak, Margaret Graham, J. A. Vitkus, Matthew Vlasic, C. A. Wachowiak, Margaret Walsh, Warren Wise, Fred Wildermuth, Gary, Ind.

Peter Belzeski, John J. Bochnowski, Albert Lesniak, Leo Bonaventura, Jos. W. Dunsing, D. W. Dupes, Max M. Friedman, Margaret R. Hannusin, Alan E. Lewis, John Manta, Lloyd Hurst, Mike Marcovich, D. L. Mitchell, George Mosny, John Packer, R. H. Smith, John J. Block, Jos. Wleklinski, East Chicago, Ind.

The Brazil Trust Co., Burns Agency, Lester Cagle Insurance Agency, Ray L. Coughanowr, May Garrison, Oscar Houk, Indiana Agency, Kidd Insurance Agencies, McQueen & Morgan, J. O. Mullinix Insurance Agency, A. B. Nees & Sons, C. Herman Pell & Son, John Randolph, W. E. Schultz, Rousch & Long, Don Staley, Worth Stigler, Bruan Meyer, Brazil, Ind.

The Geo. H. Knollenberg Co., F. H. Haner, president, Richmond, Ind.

Davis Auto Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

La Fayette Board of Fire & Casualty Underwriters, N. O. Neiburger, W. G. Thomas, J. C. Goris, F. A. Tedford, Ralph Mayerstein, E. E. Hollenbeck, George W. Burnell, Floys Brunton, Ray Adams, Richard Underwood, C. H. Hockema, Walter Graham, Charles Nicher, Willia Teal, Charles Stallard, Clifford Bowerman, James Erickson, George Balf, William Ball, Millard Overton, Harold Brelsford, B. K. Dicks, George Price, James Price, Ernest Collins, La Fayette, Ind.

J. Rolland Stinson, Leslie N. Carter, Victor A. White, Geraldine Maynard, John F. Wilhelm, Norman Tapper, Paul Segrist, Charles J. Kaufman, Ruth Horan, Henry C. Reissig, Edward L. Phair, Pauline Kleinschmidt, Leo Pottlitzer, John F. Pers, Allan F. Orourke, Julius H. Meyn, Warner P. Blackmun, Alfred A. Sherbb, Carl Kummer, Sylvia Otto, Francis Barney, C. B. Knapp, Vane R. Howard, Mae Heinley, J. E. Hathaway, Walter Thornton, D. Wasserman, Howard J. Gescheidler, Walter A. McNary, Mable Knipple, P. Boersma, P. Amaphony, Fred J. Gescheidler, Howard Gescheidler, Jr., Forrest R. Hobbs, C. Fry, M. Klein, S. C. Gettler, Leslie Meyers, Edmund H. Klein, Lawrence S. Ervin, Jean Koenes, William Lavin, M. Wilson, F. P. Dall, Gibson A. Meyer, J. Chinn Ellyson, Arthur E. Ebert, George W. Clark, Theodore Moor, Anthony D. Baker, Hammond, Ind.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the people of Indiana have made a splendid and impressive contribution to the war effort. They will continue to do so; but they feel that they should be permitted to continue to use gasoline for essential purposes, and for the purposes of their businesses, because there is an abundant supply of gasoline in that area, and it is transported into and within the area only by means of trucks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator would feel that those for whom he speaks should continue to use their gasoline for nonessential purposes, if the supply on hand in that area could augment the gasoline needed for military requirements, of which there is a shortage.

Mr. WILLIS. I know the people of Indiana do not care to use a single gallon of gasoline which would contribute to the war effort, or which would relieve the shortage on the east coast; but, in view of the inadequacy of other means of transportation, they feel perfectly justified in asking that they may use the gasoline already in the vicinity, and already available. They feel it is not necessary to impose restrictions merely for the sake of regimentation or in order to indicate their sympathy with those suffering for lack of gasoline.

Mr. BREWSTER. I felt sure the Senator would be willing to cooperate.

Mr. WILLIS. I am, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know whether the situation in Indiana is like that in North Dakota, which is about a thousand miles farther west.

Mr. WILLIS. I am not informed as to the situation in North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I shall tell the Senator what it is. I had a telephone call this morning from Mr. John R. Fleck, the State representative of the National Automobile Dealers Association, stating they have all the gasoline they need, hauling it from about 190 or 200 miles west of the State. They have the trucks available. There are high-school students who desire to work on the farms. There are men living in small towns who farm out in the country, 2 miles, 4 miles, 6 miles, 8 miles, who need gasoline to go to and fro. Is the situation in Indiana like that in North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIS. It is very similar to it.

DEDICATION OF TWO LOCKS ON ST. MARYS RIVER

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report favorably House bill 1258, and I submit a report (No. 300) thereon.

If I may have the attention of the acting majority leader and the minority leader, the sole purpose of the bill is to officially name the two new locks which have been built at Sault Ste. Marie. There is no controversy about it. It is desired that the matter should be officially concluded at once, because the dedication is to occur on July 4, and I am asking whether there is any objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Did the bill have a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It did, of the Committee on Commerce and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McNARY. I join in the request.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1258) to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appro-

priations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator in charge of the pending bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I should like to state to him that I think he would be justified in giving notice that the Senate will remain in session today until it passes the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very happy to have the matter take that direction, if it appeals to the leaders of the majority and the minority.

Mr. McNARY. I think the notice should be given. The bill will have a long and rough road after it passes, and it is as important a bill as any that has been before the Senate. It is as important as the Navy appropriation bill or the Army appropriation bill. We must have food first. We have been considering the bill for several days, and it must go to conference, the conference report must be agreed to, and the bill must be signed by the President by the 30th of June. I think we should remain in session today until we finish the consideration of the bill, and if I were in charge of the bill, I would give notice to that effect, because it is proper to give such notice either the day before or early on the day when such an order is desired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that, so far as I am concerned, I will cooperate with him to the fullest. If he wishes to give the notice now, and have the Senate remain in session until the consideration of the bill is completed, I will do everything I can to cooperate with him and uphold his hands in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that it is of the utmost importance to have the bill pass the Senate at the earliest possible date. We are several weeks later with the bill this year than we have been in times past. Last year the bill was not presented to the President until after the 1st of July, and that situation caused a great deal of confusion. The previous year the bill reached the President, due to the length of time we spent on it in conference between the House and the Senate, on the last day of the fiscal year. There will probably be more difficulties in the conference this year than there ever have been before, and we will require all the time possible in an effort to iron out the differences between the two bodies.

In view of the great importance of taking action on the bill at the earliest possible time I shall accept the suggestion of the two leaders, and I serve notice that I shall insist that the Senate remain in session today until action on the bill can be concluded.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. EGINIO MORINIGO M., PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the President of Paraguay will shortly visit the Senate. I ask that the Chair appoint a committee to escort him to the floor of the Senate, and that then the Senate

stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to meet the President of Paraguay and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Gen. Higinio Morínigo M., President of Paraguay, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. HILL, Mr. McNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Paraguay, including His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Luis Argaña, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay; His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Rogelio Espinoza, Minister of Finance of Paraguay; Lt. Col. Victoriano Benitez Vera; Lt. Col. Manuel Rodriguez; Maj. Eugenio Reichert, aide-de-camp to the President of Paraguay; the Honorable Dr. Jorge Escobar, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay; Lt. Comdr. Pedro Meyer, naval aide to the President of Paraguay; the Honorable Wesley Frost, American Ambassador to Paraguay; Brig. Gen. Charles L. Mullins, Jr., United States Army, military aide; Capt. Frank Loftin, United States Navy, naval aide; and R. D. Muir, Division of Protocol, Department of State, entered the Chamber and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I introduce to you the President of Paraguay.

[Applause. Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY

His Excellency Gen. Higinio Morínigo M., President of Paraguay, addressed the Senate as follows:

Señor Presidente, Señores Senadores, bien está la suntuosidad del Capitolio para albergar entre sus muros gigantes los figuras próceres de las ilustres personalidades cuyas estatuas enfilan en la Rotonda como mudos guardianes de la impercedera tradición de esta Casa, de donde ha salido la sabia legislación democrática que tan marcada influencia ha ejercido en el progreso material y espiritual de esta gran Nación.

Elevado es el honor que significa para mí el ocupar esta tribuna, no precisamente como Presidente de una nación hermana de la vuestra, sino, sobre todo, como ciudadano de América, como miem-

bro de la gran familia constituida en torno a una causa común.

Los Estados Unidos de América se incorporaron a la vida independiente sobre la base de un programa bien definido, que aparece en el Acta de la Declaración de Independencia, de 1776, y es completado después por la Constitución Nacional, la Carta de Garantías Individuales y la oración de Gettysburg.

Dicha Declaración de Independencia es, a mi juicio, el documento más trascendental de su género. Empieza con la enunciación del hermoso principio jurídico internacional según el cual "la independencia e igualdad de las naciones de la tierra es un derecho que emana de las leyes de la naturaleza y del Dios de esa naturaleza"; proclama, en el orden público, "que todos los hombres nacen libres; que a todos les confiere su Creador ciertos derechos inalienables entre los cuales están la vida, la libertad y la busca de la felicidad"; y sienta, en materia política, uno de los principios cardinales en los regímenes democráticos: "Que para garantizar estos derechos, los hombres instituyen gobiernos que deriven sus justos poderes del consentimiento de los gobernados."

Desde la fecha memorable de aquella declaración de Jefferson han pasado más de 166 años; y, sin embargo, aquellos principios siguen siendo piedras angulares de la construcción jurídica de los pueblos libres.

Los Estados Unidos de América se han anticipado en trece años a la Revolución Francesa, en la "Declaración de los derechos del hombre y del ciudadano," trasegada después a los demás países del Continente para estructurar las constituciones que modelaron las nuevas nacionalidades que forman la gran familia americana.

Mi patria, al igual que los otros países de América y siguiendo el ejemplo de la hermana mayor del Norte, adoptó la forma democrática de gobierno. Ha sido y es un país democrático desde las más remotas épocas de su historia. Fué paraguaya la revolución llamada de los Comuneros, quienes en 1727, mucho antes de promediar el siglo XVIII, ya habían proclamado, ante la faz del mundo, que la voluntad del común o pueblo debe estar por encima de todas las voluntades, como principio y emanación que es de las autoridades públicas.

Ha venido rigiéndose hasta 1939 por una de las constituciones más liberales del mundo.

Las nuevas cuestiones planteadas en el terreno del derecho puro inspiraron la reforma de 1939, para tratar de poner aquella ley fundamental en consonancia y asegurar un mayor bienestar general, con las modernas conquistas del derecho. El problema no fué planteado como un abandono de la ruta seguida hasta entonces para campear por sendas distintas, sino como una rectificación de la marcha para procurar acelerarla convenientemente y alejar obstáculos y espejismos, de acuerdo con las modernas corrientes ideológicas y por el mismo procedimiento que habían puesto en práctica otros países americanos. No na respondido a ninguna tendencia absolu-

tista sino al sano propósito de satisfacer una necesidad, sin desmedrar, como se expresa en la exposición de motivos, los principios cardinales de la democracia americana, consignados en la Constitución de Filadelfia.

Es indudable que el sistema democrático, como organización política y social, es el único que se conforma con la naturaleza del hombre; pero es también indudable que todo sistema o cuerpo de doctrina puede y debe ser modificado a la luz de la verdad, sin remover, claro está, la base de la construcción jurídica para no caer en el absurdo de pretender sostener la fábrica en el aire. "El conocimiento de la verdad," lo dice una inscripción burilada en el frontispicio de la galería central de la Biblioteca de este Congreso, "es el bien soberano de la naturaleza humana."

Con lo dicho, no he querido significar que se trate de una obra acabada. Antes, por el contrario, creo que la reforma no carece de errores y omisiones. Tal es la razón por la cual he propiciado últimamente una revisión de la misma, en consulta hecha al pueblo de mi país con resultado favorable, y siempre en vista de los principios básicos de una verdadera democracia.

La edad contemporánea en la división cronológica de la historia universal, arranca de la Revolución Francesa. Lo justo, en mi sentir, hubiera sido tomar como punto de partida la fecha de la Independencia de los Estados Unidos de América, de la aprobación, por el Segundo Congreso Continental, de las hermosas declaraciones a que he aludido hace un momento, por lo menos en América, donde aquella simiente de libertad ha germinado en instituciones que honran a los pueblos que forman la comunidad americana, al amparo de idénticas inquietudes cívicas y de comunes aspiraciones.

A la vista de los acontecimientos producidos en los últimos diez años, acaso no sea aventurado afirmar que una nueva era histórica se ha iniciado en el Nuevo Mundo. Recordaré solamente dos de dichos acontecimientos:

Primero.—El advenimiento de la política de la "Buena Vecindad" que nació con la asunción del mando por el Presidente Roosevelt cuando desde los umbrales de este Capitolio dijo que, en el campo de las relaciones internacionales dedicaría esta Nación a la política "de un buen vecino que se respete a sí mismo y que, por hacerlo así, respete los derechos de los otros; de un vecino que en un mundo de vecinos, haga honor a sus obligaciones y a la santidad de sus convenios."

Y segundo. La consolidación del Panamericanismo, desde la Primera Reunión de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores, en Panamá en 1939, hasta la Tercera de Río de Janeiro, de 1942, y cuyo resultado inmediato ha sido la más grandiosa cooperación de los países americanos que registra la historia, para defenderse del peligro común que golpeó sus puertas con el ataque alevoso de Pearl Harbor, luchar por el mantenimiento de los eternos principios de la libertad y de la justicia, que gobiernan la convivencia social.

y propender a la formación de un mundo mejor que el presente, sobre la base del respeto de la moral y el derecho y la observancia de una real confraternidad, como principios esenciales de la democracia.

El Paraguay ha cumplido y cumplirá fiel y honradamente todos sus compromisos internacionales. Ha roto sus relaciones diplomáticas, económicas y financieras con las naciones del Eje, antes que la Tercera Reunión de Cancilleres de Río de Janeiro clausurara sus sesiones.

Respetuoso de su tradición y fervoroso partidario de los principios enunciados, no ha titubeado ni un solo instante para ponerse del lado de los Estados Unidos de América y de las otras naciones hermanas en la más espantosa tragedia que haya concebido la imaginación y recuerda la historia de todos los tiempos.

El pueblo paraguayo reafirma, por mi intermedio, en esta ocasión solemne, su adhesión a la causa de este glorioso país, que es causa de América, y rinde su homenaje al heroísmo de sus esforzados combatientes por la libertad y la justicia.

[Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The English translation of the address by the President of the Republic of Paraguay is as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate of the United States, the magnificence of the Capitol is fitting to shelter within its gigantic walls the outstanding figures of the illustrious persons whose statues stand in the rotunda as mute guardians of the imperishable traditions of this House from which has emanated the wise democratic legislation that has exercised such marked influence on the material and spiritual progress of this great Nation.

It signifies a high honor for me to occupy this rostrum, not only as President of your sister nation, but above all as a citizen of the Americas, as a member of the great family of nations united around a common cause.

The United States of America entered into an independent life on the basis of a well-defined program that appears in the Declaration of Independence of 1776, completed later by the Constitution and by the Bill of Rights and the Gettysburg Address.

The Declaration of Independence is, in my opinion, the most transcendental document of its kind. It begins with the enunciation of the fine international juridical principle according to which "the separate and equal station of the nations of the world is a right to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them"; it proclaims in the public order "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and it establishes in political matters one of the cardinal principles of democratic regimes, "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Since the memorable date of that Jeffersonian declaration more than 166 years have passed, and still

those principles continue to be the foundation stones of the juridical structure of the free people.

Thirteen years before the French Revolution, the United States of America had set forth the principles of the Bill of Rights, which later served as a model to the new nations of the great American family in the framing of their constitutions.

My country, together with the other countries of America, and following the example of the older sister from the north, adopted a democratic form of government. It has been and is a democratic country since the early days of its history. Paraguayan in origin was the revolution of the Comuneros which in 1727, long before the middle of the eighteenth century, proclaimed to the whole world that the will of the common people must be above all other wills, as a principle which belongs to public authority.

Up until 1939 Paraguay had governed itself by one of the most liberal constitutions in the world.

The new questions which arose in the field of pure law inspired the reform of 1939, in order to place that fundamental law in harmony with the modern conquest of law; and assure a greater well-being. The problem was not stated with a view to abandoning the road followed up to then and traveling by a different one, but with a view to modifying the direction and trying to expedite it in a convenient way, leaving out obstacles and illusions, in accordance with the modern ideologies, and in line with the processes that other American countries had established. It has not followed any absolutist tendency, but the sound purpose of satisfying a need without impairing, as stated in the declaration of purposes, the cardinal principles of the American democracy contained in the Philadelphia Constitution.

There is no doubt that the democratic system, as a political and social organization, is the only one which conforms with man's nature; but it is also true that any system or body or doctrine can and must be modified in the light of truth without removing, of course, the bases of the juridical structure so that it may not err by trying to operate in a vacuum. "The inquiry, knowledge, and belief of truth," as stated in an inscription in the facade of the central gallery of the Library of this Congress, "is the sovereign good of human nature."

I do not need to state that we are not dealing with a finished work. Rather, I believe in the reform of its flaws and omissions. That is why I have advocated recently its revision, after consulting my people with favorable results, and always considering the basic principles of a true democracy.

In the chronological division of universal history, the contemporary age starts with the French Revolution. The fair thing in my opinion would have been to take as the starting point the date of the independence of the United States of America, of the approval, by the Second Continental Congress, of the outstanding statements to which I have just referred, at least in America, where the seed of

liberty has sprouted into institutions which honor the peoples that are a part of the American community and that live under the same civic preoccupation and the same common aspirations.

In the light of events in the United States during the past 10 years, it may not be unreasonable to state that a new era in history has begun in the New World. Let me review but two of these events:

First, The inception of the good-neighbor policy, coincidental with the inauguration of President Roosevelt, who, from the rostrum of this Capitol said that in the field of international relations he dedicated this Nation to the "good neighbor who respects himself and who, therefore, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who, in a world of neighbors, honors his obligations and the sanctity of his word."

And, second, the consolidation of pan-Americanism, from the first meeting of foreign ministers in Panama in 1939, to the third such meeting, in Rio de Janeiro in 1942, the immediate result of which was the most magnificent cooperation of the American countries ever recorded in history, for the purpose of defending themselves against the common danger which struck against them with the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, of struggling for the maintenance of the undying principles of liberty and justice which govern their living together, and of aiming at the formation of a world better than the present one on the basis of respect for the principles of ethics and law and of the practice of a true fraternity, as principles essential to a democracy.

Paraguay has kept and will continue to keep faithfully and honorably all her international pledges. Even before the third meeting of foreign ministers in Rio had come to a close, she had broken all diplomatic, economic, and financial ties with the Axis.

Respectful of her tradition and an active advocate of the principles expressed, she has not hesitated a single moment to put herself on the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the greatest tragedy which the imagination has conceived and which history has recorded in all time.

The Paraguayan people reaffirm, through me, in this solemn occasion, their adherence to the cause of this glorious country, which is also the cause of all America, and pay homage to the heroism of its brave fighting men in the fight for liberty and justice.

Following his address, the President of Paraguay and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WALLGREN in the Chair).

LIDICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, 1 year ago this afternoon a group of individuals from the Nazi Army entered the little town of Lidice, in Czechoslovakia, and exterminated hundreds of innocent people living in that simple village. When

those human beasts had finished their dastardly deed they proclaimed that Lidice had been wiped off the face of the earth. But, Mr. President, the effect of those cruel acts has been just the opposite of what the leader of that murderous gang said it would be. Lidice lives in the hearts of all the civilized world. In Illinois, for instance, my home State, a little village has been named Lidice out of sympathy for the people who died at the hands of those vicious monsters.

Today there appears in the New York Times an editorial entitled "Not Extinguished." The editorial is highly illuminating and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT EXTINGUISHED

A year ago this afternoon German troops began to gather along the roads leading into a little Bohemian village not far from Prague. Few persons outside of Bohemia had ever heard the name of this village, but it was dear to those who lived in it. On the previous day Reinhard Heydrich, who had earned the love and admiration of many Germans by killing a great multitude of helpless and innocent people, had been buried in the Invaliden Cemetery in Berlin. He had lingered a week in agony after two men, who were never captured and whose names were never known, had jumped on the running board of his car on the road from Berlin to Prague and fired two bullets into his spine—or perhaps threw a grenade which had the same effect. By the afternoon of June 10 the Nazis, by their own story, had killed 261 Czechs in revenge for Heydrich. They killed women. They killed authors and professors. But they were not satisfied. Shortly before 8 o'clock, a year ago tonight, armed men—it would be an insult to a stern but honorable profession to call them soldiers—began to move into the little Bohemian village.

That same evening (the exact sequence of events is not quite clear, but apparently the troops were at their work in the village at that time) the Berlin radio announced that arms, an illegal radio station, subversive printed material, and hoards of rationed commodities had been discovered. It then stated:

"After these facts had been ascertained all male adults of the town were shot, while the women were placed in a concentration camp, and the children were entrusted to appropriate educational institutions. The township was leveled to the ground and the name of the community extinguished. The inhabitants of Lidice, near Kladno, No. 483."

A year has gone by. There is no spot on earth where a free press exists that the name of this obscure little village is not known. It has become a part of every language. The poor, humble folk who died there are immortal. They are in every town in occupied Europe. They march with every army. They will gather on every road and behind every hedge, rock, and tree when the great Nazi retreat begins. If there is any wavering on any front, any faint cry of appeasement, it is they who will go silently forward with their bayonets, making sure of no compromise, no mercy for butchers. The armed men who were at Lidice, in Bohemia, on the evening of June 10, 1942, those who sent them there, those who committed similar crimes in other places, and those who ordered such crimes, will then know that the Berlin broadcast erred in one particular. The community of Lidice was not extinguished.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion just one further word:

Out of the ashes of the holocaust we are now fighting throughout the world it is my prayer and my hope that villages like Lidice that have been overrun, whose people have been murdered and property completely destroyed, may be reconstructed and firmly and impregnably established in the future, for all time to come. It is my hope that valiant nations such as Czechoslovakia and other small nations that have been conquered by ruthless, totalitarian despots may once again take their rightful place in a civilized world where peace, amity, and good will shall reign forever.

THE CRITICAL CANNED-FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the beginning of the session today we heard the statement that the passage of the pending bill was the most important matter before the Senate, and that the Senate should promptly complete the consideration of the bill. I hesitate to trespass on the time of the Senate, but I desire to bring again to its attention the same subject on which I spoke yesterday. That is the importance of getting food into cans for our own people and for our armed forces. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement which came to my desk, and in which a gentleman from my State sums up his experience during the past week, after visiting various agencies and divisions in Washington. He says:

I give you a digest of the conversation. It is as follows:

"Question. Can you supply male help for our canning plant to preserve food?"

"Answer. No, no help for canning plants, only for the farmers."

"Question. Then, will you allow me to pay enough wages to get the help?"

"Answer. No, not for the canning plants. You can increase wages on the farms and in defense plants, but not in the canning plants."

Mr. President, I repeat what I said yesterday, that this Government must take action within the next few weeks, or else a great portion of the pea crop of the country will not be canned, and then will come the other crops—corn, cabbage, and so forth.

Let me read into the RECORD a letter which very graphically depicts a critical situation. It comes from Martin Meeter, of Union Grove, Wis.

JUNE 7, 1943.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Our canning plant is located at Union Grove, Wis., a village of less than 1,000 inhabitants.

We receive between six and seven thousand tons of vegetables for canning.

Since last winter we have tried desperately to obtain relief on the matter of wages and manpower as we realize that this rural district will not furnish enough help to preserve the crops in the canning plant this year.

Now it appears that the situation is so serious we will have to close up the plant.

The War Labor Board has refused our repeated requests for wage increases to meet current wage levels in that area. Defense plants in Racine are paying 90 cents per hour for common labor. This canning plant must pick up 40 or 50 men and 150 to 200 women during the canning season beginning the first of August on tomatoes.

We have been packing several hundred thousands cases of canned vegetables for the military and lend-lease and have commitments for this year.

A recent Government ruling permits an increase of 10 cents per hour above the wage being paid in the canning plant at the close of last year's packing season. This for common labor would equal 60 cents per hour in our plant. We know, of course, that no one in that area would work for 60 cents an hour in a canning plant, a temporary job, when he can obtain 90 cents per hour in a defense plant nearby.

Now on top of all this, Government is building a \$250,000 hemp plant in the same village. The construction company is about to begin this work and must complete this construction before October 1. They will use all the available common labor in the country and are offering to pay \$1.10 per hour.

Mr. Senator, this is about the last straw. We have tried to organize and are organizing a food army in this village, including some businessmen and many valiant patriotic women who will do all they can. But you can't run a canning plant such as this with all inexperienced help.

We have lost quite a few men who have gone into the service, others to farms as farmers have been permitted to pay higher wages, and to defense plants. Even at this time we have not enough help left to finish packing some canned sauerkraut on last year's Government orders. Then what will the situation be when perishable tomatoes arrive in August? I have contracted for a good many thousand tons of tomatoes and cabbage for kraut which is now being planted. What am I going to do with it?

We have worked on this matter for several months, hopefully thinking that the proper agencies in Washington would permit us to pay comparative wages or assist in some manner to get the necessary manpower. We have worked diligently with the United States Employment Service at Racine, who admitted to me a few days ago that they were all through—they can't do anything for us at such wage levels.

Through our canners' associations and in person we have appealed again and again for relief—the matter of adequate wages and manpower—but now all doors seem to be closed.

It seems we have to choose between two things: Either we pack the food and violate the law, or we obey the law and lose the food.

This is no idle threat. I cannot ask even those few men I have left to work for us at such inadequate wages when they can walk right out of the plant and get 30 to 40 cents per hour more. Everyone of them has a family to support.

If it was an ordinary business venture we would close up the plant, but this means food for our boys out there and for the Nation, and this must not be. But I see no alternative. What am I to do?

Yours very truly,

MARTIN MEETER,
MEETER'S, INC.,
Union Grove, Wis.

One man says:

I called my men together in the factory a few days ago. They are men with families, who have worked in the factory from 5 to 12 years, just like a family group. We call each other by our first names. Can you imagine what a pleasant task it was for me to explain I could do nothing more for them, that I knew every man in the group could walk out and get 30 cents per hour more across the street in a war plant, and 40 to 50 to 60 cents more by going into the hemp plant that the Government is putting up, putting \$250,000 of its own money into it.

The Government is stealing men away from food production, and is granting no relief. We must get help to the canners. Let me repeat what one man says:

If it were an ordinary business venture, we would close up the plant, but this means food for our boys out there and for the Nation.

Recently former President Hoover spoke on the subject of food. An editorial entitled "Program for Food," was published in last evening's Washington Star. The editorial comments on former President Hoover's statement. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR FOOD

Herbert Hoover, addressing the American Farm Bureau Federation in New York, issued a solemn warning that our food supply is decreasing while the demand for food, at the same time, is rising rapidly. The former President, who was Food Administrator for the United States during the last war and today is a keen student of the food problem, made a series of recommendations which deserve serious consideration.

The program suggested by Mr. Hoover is designed to give this country its maximum production of food. This must be assured, not only to maintain the American people and to win the war, but to make it possible to provide food for millions of persons in the United Nations and other millions in countries that have been overrun by the Axis Powers. There can be no lasting peace without food.

Chief among the recommendations is that forty or fifty million more acres be planted in 1944 than in this year. Only by greatly increased planting will it be possible to produce more and more foodstuffs. During the period from 1932 to 1939 the administration, by its restrictive policies toward agriculture, reduced the acreage of 17 leading crops planted in this country by 47,000,000 acres. Farmers were paid not to produce. It is idle now to comment on the folly of the economy of scarcity. The thing to do is to get away from it—and never to return. These 17 crops constitute about 95 percent of the whole harvested area.

It seems incredible but it is nevertheless true, as Mr. Hoover pointed out, that after the passage of the Lease-Lend Act the Government undertook to increase food production but at the same time continued payments to farmers to restrict production. These restrictive payments were not removed until this spring. In some cases they still persist.

Mr. Hoover also includes in his recommendations a proposal that one agency, headed by one man, take over the whole administration of the food problem. At present nine agencies of the Government are telling the farmers, the food distributors, and wholesalers and retailers what to do about production, distribution, and prices. The result, in Mr. Hoover's opinion, is chaos.

In order to increase the farm-planting acreage, it will be necessary to have increased farm labor and more farm machinery. Declaring that the present price system is stifling farm production, Mr. Hoover proposed that the retail and wholesale price ceilings be done away with. Price fixing must begin as near the source of production as possible, and from there on regulations against profiteering must be placed upon the trades. Prices to the farmers must include floors as well as ceilings, and the prices must take into account labor and other costs. Such

a plan would be calculated really to stimulate production.

In 1942 we had bumper crops. This year the harvest is likely to be normal—which means that the actual production of food will be considerably below the crop we have just about eaten up. There is nothing that can be done to meet this situation immediately. The plantings for the following crop, however, will be of vast importance.

If the statistics for the crops of the last year are correct, then in the opinion of Mr. Hoover, some bureaucracy has strangled the flow of food from the farm to the housewife. This is the only explanation of reports that have come from all sections of the country showing scarcity of foods. And if this be true, the sooner the hand of bureaucracy is lifted the better.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders give consideration to the matter of getting labor into the canning plants. I ask it not for the canners, but for my country. I ask it because if we do not, as was stated yesterday, the most valuable munition of the country, namely, food, will not be there when the armed forces need it and when the country needs it. The situation is so critical that I trust some action will be taken by the appropriate arm of Government to the end that these factories may get the necessary labor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. GORE, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON, and Mr. FLOESER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,497,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 11, 12, and 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the proviso.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

"For the Bituminous Coal Division, fiscal year 1943, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828-849), as further amended by the Act of April 24, 1943 (Public Law 40), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the

same objects of expenditure, \$700,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1944."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 8, 37, 41, 60, and 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
R. B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TAHER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 8, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 37, and 41 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "Department" insert "or the Department of State or the Office of Strategic Services"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to said bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be noted that the House amended Senate amendment No. 5 by adding to the exceptions the State Department and the Office of Strategic Services. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment, and before the period, insert "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Undoubtedly that Bureau should be included as an exception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

LXXXIX—353

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on Senate amendment No. 5, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60, which is the only amendment of substance now in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate that Senate amendment No. 60, as to which there is disagreement, relates to the action of the House in providing that no part of the appropriation should be used to pay the salaries of Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Dr. Lovett. The Senate is familiar with this matter. The Senate struck out this provision in the House bill after the House had adopted it by an enormous majority, as I recall by a vote of 3 to 1, or 2 to 1, and since that time the House, by voice vote, has practically unanimously insisted upon retaining the provision. It is necessary for the Senate conferees to have a yea-and-nay vote so as to know what the will of the Senate is before we go into the conference. Therefore, in order to bring the question before the Senate, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion. So far as I am concerned, I am not taking any position one way or the other, but I wish to have the judgment of the Senate. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60, and I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not certain that I thoroughly understand the explanation with respect to the last amendment to which the Senator from Tennessee referred. Will the Senator be so kind as to repeat his explanation of the amendment?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

The House adopted an amendment which became a part of the House bill providing that no part of the appropriation carried in this bill shall be used to pay the salaries of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. That amendment was agreed to in the House by an overwhelming majority—about three to one. It came over to the Senate and the Senate committee struck it out. Following the recommendation of its committee, the Senate struck out the House provision, and the amendment went to conference. Since then the House has voted to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment. As I recall, the vote was almost unanimous. Therefore I wish to get the sense of the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote so that the Senate conferees may know exactly how the Senate feels about it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Did the Senate committee before striking out the House pro-

vision, investigate the facts as did the House?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; it investigated the facts. The conferees had additional facts which were not before the Senate committee. They were brought before the conference so that both sides were fully advised, and I believe every Senator is fully advised about the question. I wish to have the sense of the Senate on the question before the amendment again goes to conference.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that when the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill there were no facts on this matter before the Appropriations Committee, but they were to ascertain what the facts really were when they got into conference.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no. We had a great deal of testimony brought before the committee when the matter was before it. We had all the facts except some on which the House acted, which were regarded as being secret. But afterward, in the conference, those secret facts were brought before the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Were those secret facts, which apparently no one can find out about, developed by the Kerr committee?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Why is it that the Senate, as a whole, may not know what those facts are?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The evidence is very voluminous, and it would take quite a while to state it. I see no reason in the world why it should be secret.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I am not blaming the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a very peculiar and unusual case. Evidence was taken by the Kerr committee of the House of Representatives, against three individuals, and no one, with the exception of those who were members of the Kerr committee, and those who were members of the conference committee, can find out what the facts are with respect to these three men. To me, this is most significant.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The evidence was very voluminous. It was undertaken to show before the committee that these three men were members of the Communist Party, and that one man was a member of several score organizations which were more or less subversive—I believe that is the word that is used—and there was much ado about it. Much of the testimony was from the three witnesses themselves. They were brought before that committee. We read their explanations. I think the Senator can easily understand what the nature of the testimony was. There was plenty of testimony adduced on all sides in order that the committee could make up its mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make a brief statement in conclusion. No Member of the Senate is more opposed to the subversive elements in this country than is the Senator from Illinois. However, I will not vote blindly to discharge three individuals from Government employment upon secret testimony which was developed by the Kerr committee of the House of Representatives, and about which the Senate knows nothing.

Apparently these men are being discharged from appointive positions because of what was developed before the Kerr committee, the Senate being denied the opportunity to peruse that evidence. To discharge the men under such circumstances is tantamount to convicting them as being Communists without a hearing or trial.

Mr. President, I say that this is a dangerous precedent for the Senate to establish, or even consider, and I shall not be a party to it. It does violence to fundamental principles of free government. If I had all the facts which were disclosed to the Kerr committee, and had an opportunity to analyze them, I might reach a different conclusion; but I do not intend blindly to vote to condemn individuals who are on the public pay roll at the present time, brand and classify them among those who seek by subversive measures to overthrow the Government, without clear and convincing evidence. That is what it means. I simply cannot do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I understand the Senator from Illinois, he will vote for the motion which I am now making to insist further on amendment No. 60?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such action will be in accord with the desire of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to make a statement as to my understanding of the case involving these three men. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill. When the bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives it contained this provision barring the further employment of these three men. There was not a scintilla of evidence in the House hearings taken by the subcommittee in charge of this bill with reference to any one of the three men.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I took the position in the committee hearing, and I still take the position that we ought not to condemn any citizen of the United States without charges being preferred against him, giving him opportunity to appear and to be heard, and certainly without any evidence in support of the condemnation pronounced against him by the bill passed by the other House. My recollection is that not one of these three men appeared before our subcommittee,

but there were those who appeared in their defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Notably, Secretary Ickes and a number of other gentlemen.

Mr. OVERTON. The only evidence we had was in exculpation of these individuals, and no one appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate making any charges of subversive influences against these men or charges of any character. Therefore the record is bare of any charges and bare of any evidence against any of them.

If they are, as has been suggested, Communists, if they belong to an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government, we have in every legislation appropriation bill a provision under which each one of them can be brought to the bar of justice. I shall quote from the provision which appears in every appropriation act as the Senator from Tennessee well knows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence—

That, let me say by way of inference, is merely prima facie evidence, and is put in there in order to protect the disbursing officer who pays those who are employed by the Government out of the appropriations contained in the appropriation acts.

Provided further, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Those are the pertinent parts of the provision which I wish to read to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. One of these men, Mr. Dodd, comes from Virginia. He is the son of a former Ambassador to Germany. Am I to understand that these three men were called before the committee to make statements?

Mr. OVERTON. None of them appeared before the House committee considering the appropriation bill in which they have been condemned, and none appeared before the Senate committee.

Mr. BYRD. Is there any evidence before the committee that they are members of communistic organizations?

Mr. OVERTON. There was none before the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, just a moment. I think Secretary Ickes testified that, so far as one of them was concerned—Dr. Lovett—that Dr. Lovett's principal difficulty in his mind was that he belonged to too many organizations, or something of that kind. That was the extent to which he admitted that he belonged to a number of these organizations.

Mr. BYRD. He said he belonged to communistic organizations?

Mr. McKELLAR. Organizations which were communistically inclined. It depends upon who has the say-so as to whether an organization is communistic.

Mr. BYRD. Did he say that Mr. Lovett belonged to organizations which were inclined to overthrow democracy in this country?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I listened to the testimony of Secretary Ickes, and he did make the statement that the trouble with the man was that he was a joiner; he would join anything that came along; but I do not think he pointed out any communistic organization with which he had been affiliated.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee, in whom I have the most supreme confidence, can say that any of these men are actual members of a Communist organization, I intend to support the movement to dismiss them from the Government service, if that is the only way to bring about their dismissal. Of course, I think the Department should dismiss them, but if the Department refuses to dismiss them, knowing them to be members of communistic organizations, while I disapprove of this method, I must say that I should vote to let the Congress dismiss them by means of the cancellation of the appropriation. What I want to know is, Is there any evidence which has been brought to the attention of the committee which is conclusive to the Senator from Louisiana that any of these men are members of communistic organizations?

Mr. OVERTON. It is my recollection that the testimony failed to show that any one of them was affiliated with any communistic organization. I may be in error.

Mr. BYRD. That was the charge made in the House of Representatives, was it not, when the matter was considered there?

Mr. OVERTON. It was not made before the Appropriations Committee handling this bill. I understand that there was an investigation made by the Kerr committee, and the Kerr committee made a report, but the evidence in support of the report has never been laid before either the House or the Senate. What are the facts according to the report, I do not know, and I doubt if any other Senator knows. I have never read it. According to my recollection, there was no evidence at all presented against any one of these three men that they were

affiliated with any communistic organization.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Louisiana that none of these men are affiliated with or are members of any communistic organization?

Mr. OVERTON. If I may answer, I will say that it is my opinion that there is no evidence whatsoever to show that any of them was connected with any communistic organization. That is my recollection; I may be in error.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Louisiana has already partly answered the question which I desired to ask him. It is a fact, is it not, that these men have been condemned so far as the action of one body is concerned, without any hearing whatever, except in star-chamber proceedings, the records of which are not available to the membership even of the Committee on Appropriations of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or to the ordinary mine-run Members of the Senate or House? In other words, we do not know on what basis the so-called Kerr committee arrived at its conclusion that these men were disqualified to hold office.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, according to all the information I have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not hold a brief for any of these men. It may be that they are not fit to hold office, but, so far as I am concerned, I would not convict at all in the absence of evidence which was conclusive to my mind that the men concerned were guilty. This is essentially a penal proceeding, a most extraordinary penal proceeding, whereby it is asked that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, composing the Congress of the United States, pass judgment upon men, as I have said, in an essentially penal proceeding, certainly imposing moral obloquy upon them, without knowing what we are doing.

I do not know any of these men. I may say that some of the public activities of some of them are activities of which I have not approved, some of their expressed opinions are opinions of which I do not approve, but as to Dr. Lovett, I do know that his son was a gallant soldier in the Second Division in the World War, and was killed at the Battle of Belleau Wood. It is going to be very hard to make me believe that a man whose son gave his life for his country in the last war in a very gallant fighting division, is guilty of undertaking to tear down the Government of the United States. I certainly am not willing to reach any such opinion in the absence of specific evidence conclusive to my own mind.

It seems to me that it is a most extraordinary and reprehensible practice to condemn men who have never had a hearing in the open, on evidence about which we know nothing, or undertake to

shift the burden of proof to the shoulders of the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Tennessee, or any other respected Senator, trying to make them give a guaranty that these men have not been guilty. It seems to me the burden of proof is on someone to prove that they are not qualified, and if they are connected with any organization interested in tearing down the Government of the United States, that is adequately already taken care of in the law to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred.

Mr. OVERTON. I thoroughly agree with the observations made by the Senator from Missouri. As I understand the situation, these men are being condemned without any hearing, and without any evidence whatsoever, insofar as the committee is concerned.

There is no one who abhors communism more than I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Louisiana in that expression.

Mr. OVERTON. I abhor any organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force of arms, so much so, as the Senator from Missouri may recall, that I busied myself in preparing the very clause which I read, and, without much difficulty, got the committee of the Senate to adopt it in the first act in which it was adopted, and agreed to in conference, and it has been incorporated in every similar act since. If these men are Communists, under this clause they cannot be employed, they cannot be paid, and they are subject to trial and sentence before the courts of justice of the land.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But they are entitled to a day in court, which they are not being accorded under this procedure.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly they are entitled to a day in court.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Washington asked me to yield, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, it seems to me that this sort of procedure should be challenging to every lawyer in this body, and there are some very able lawyers in the Senate, and men who have served on the bench. I think every one of them must shrink at the contemplation of a proceeding which amounts to a bill of attainder, in the absence of any formal hearing, or the production of any proof which would be convincing and persuasive.

Like my colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas]. I have not heard any of the testimony or evidence, and in the light of what the able Senator from Louisiana has said, it puts us in a peculiar light to sit here as a jury and approve what has been done. Gentlemen of the Senate, we constitute ourselves a jury, and in the absence of any facts at all being presented to us, we lawyers in this body would be placing ourselves in the position of doing a thing we would indict vigorously if a court in our own community should attempt to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, the Senator should certainly vote for the motion I have made, which is to insist upon the Senate amendment striking out the House action.

Mr. BONE. In the light of what has been said within the past 10 minutes, I should be constrained to follow that course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to make a brief observation as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. However important the consideration of this matter, the appropriation bill is more important. The matter now being considered relates to a bill which is in conference, and we are delaying consideration of a most important bill before the Senate, and if it is to take long, I shall ask that the Senate resume the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope we can have a vote. I wish to answer a question asked by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. Secretary Ickes testified before the committee and said it was claimed there were a number of subversive organizations to which one of these men belonged, but that he did not think they were subversive. That was the testimony about the matter.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We heard one of these witnesses a year ago—Dr. Watson, I believe. He testified that he was thoroughly American; that he belonged to no communistic organization; that some of the liberal groups he joined may have afterward been influenced by certain communistic members, but that he and his father were lifelong workers in the church, that they both were ministers of religion, that his mother was engaged in religious work throughout her life, that he was an ex-service man himself; and furthermore that he was recommended very highly by the chief of the governmental agency with which he is connected. I do not believe any of these three men has been given the opportunity he deserves, and I do not believe the Senate should take action in a high-handed affair such as this presents itself to be.

Mr. President, I am against anyone working for the Government who is in favor of overthrowing the Government, but I think the integrity of the Senate is such that we should do as the Senator from Missouri has said—give these men a chance before we take summary action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oregon thinks we should not take any

more time on this matter. I know the Senator from Massachusetts is in favor of the motion, which is to insist on the Senate amendment and thereby instruct the conferees. So may we not have a vote now?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Tennessee does not want to be the only Senator to talk; does he?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I want the bill to go back to conference after the vote is taken, if the Senator understands what I mean.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is one of the most unusual requests I have heard since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have been in the Senate only 7 years, but I have never heard made a request quite like that of the Senator from Tennessee. So far as I recall, no one on the minority side has expressed himself on this matter, though a number of very able speeches, to be sure, have been made by Senators on the majority side. I do not believe the Senator from Tennessee wants to deprive the members of the minority of the opportunity to make their views plain on this question. In State legislatures there is the right to move the previous question, thereby shutting off all debate. That privilege does not exist in the Senate, and if it should ever be put into effect, I think it should apply to both sides.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that there is no objection to a continuance of the debate. If I made such a suggestion, I withdraw it.

Mr. LODGE. As a conferee, and as a member of the subcommittee, I thought it was incumbent upon me to say one or two words about this matter. I try not to burden the Senate with long speeches. In fact, I do not think I have ever made a lengthy speech in the Senate.

In my study and scrutiny of this matter I did not find justification for the procedure followed by the House. No evidence was submitted to us that these men were particularly dangerous. I may add that no evidence was submitted to show that these men were particularly well qualified for the positions which they hold, and I certainly cannot share in some of the crocodile tears which are being shed in support of these men. But obviously it is an unsound procedure for Congress to attempt to discipline officials in the executive department of the Government who have been legally and properly appointed. That the Congress has the right, under the Constitution, to refuse to vote anyone's salary of course is not open to question, but I think it is unsound policy for Congress to follow such a procedure as that proposed by the other body. For that reason I shall vote "yea," to insist on the Senate's position.

Mr. BONE. Will the Chair state the motion so we may understand the effect of our votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was detained from the Senate floor when the question before the Senate was explained. I should like to ask what evidence was presented to the House with respect to the individuals who are concerned?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, it would take a long time to make an explanation of that matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was there evidence presented to the House Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not know whether or not evidence was presented before the House committee. We had the so-called Kerr evidence before the conferees. This motion is merely to uphold the position the Senate has taken, and to send the matter back to conference, and that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 60 striking out the provision in question. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk has begun calling the roll, and I believe one Senator has voted. I hope we can continue with the vote, and that the bill be not retarded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no desire to retard the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I know the Senator has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I did want to know the issue upon which I am asked to vote. I understand the Senator from Tennessee, as the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has moved that the Senate stand by the action it has previously taken, and that the bill be sent back to conference.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on business in one of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senators from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are detained on public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on official business at one of the executive departments.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gerry	Murdock
Andrews	Gillette	Murray
Austin	Green	Nye
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Pepper
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scruggam
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McClellan	Van Nuys
Chandler	McFarland	Wallgren
Chavez	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wherry
Danaher	Maloney	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Willis

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—27

Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Moore	Truman
Davis	O'Daniel	Tydings
Downey	Radcliffe	Wagner
Eastland	Reed	Walsh
George	Revercomb	Wilson

So Mr. MCKELLAR's motion that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60 was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 61, which simply refers to the numbering.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments still in disagreement,

and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKEL-LAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYD-INGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CORPORATION—PROPOSED RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, out of order, I move that the Senate recommit Senate bill 1108, a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and to increase its borrowing power, to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I make the motion as the result of an agreement reached this morning in the committee, among the members of the committee, that I should move to have the bill recommitted for further consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am inclined to favor the motion, if the Senator will specify why he desires to have the bill recommitted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I made the motion, as I stated, at the request of the members of the committee. No hearings were held by the committee on the principal controversial feature of the bill. After the committee held hearings on the question of continuance of the corporation, the committee went into executive session to act on the bill. An amendment then was proposed on the subject of subsidies and roll-back payments; and, without dealing with the question of holding any further hearings, the committee proceeded by the very small vote of three to two to adopt an amendment to the bill.

After that action was taken, considerable desire was expressed to know more about the bill and to have some hearings held for the information of the members of the committee, at least about the controversial item in the bill. So we have held hearings for 2 days for that purpose; and this morning the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] thought—and other members of the committee including myself agreed with him, all the members of the committee being present—that probably the most helpful procedure would be to have the bill recommitted to the committee for further consideration and further hearings.

That is the reason why the motion is made. That is the only explanation I can make to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, the purport of the bill, as reported from the committee, is to legalize certain practices as to subsidies which now are being put into effect without any authority of law whatever; are they not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should not say that; no. I do not think that statement is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the correct statement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think there is authority of law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think there is any authority of law for the subsidies now being paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I rather think there is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is one of the subjects which has been discussed in the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator that, either on this bill or on any other bill, when it is reported again, if there is any effort to legalize the practices now being put into effect by Mr. Jones and the R. F. C., there will be a very prolonged and bitter fight on this floor before the bill is ever passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think that is the purpose of the program at all. No one suggested it. The only question which really stands under serious criticism is that of whether the amendment limiting the appropriation goes far enough or whether it should be enlarged. That is the point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me one further interruption, and then I shall not bother him any further—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that it seems to me there is no question whatever that the matter of subsidies is being proceeded with now in a way entirely unauthorized by law, certainly not contemplated by the act authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and, in my opinion, in plain violation of law. Any proposition to legalize what is now being done, even by way of limitation, might be construed as a legalization of it. I simply desire to say that I am in favor of the motion of the Senator from Alabama to recommit, but that any renewal of the proposition to legalize the practice now being followed by the R. F. C. will be met with bitter and prolonged opposition on this floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, we need not deal with that subject until we reach it. I do not even know that it will be necessary for the Senate to take such action.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the request is made somewhat untimely. I share the view of the Senator from Missouri. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the motion is not in order until unanimous consent is obtained, and I object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is a substitute for the committee amendment beginning on page 89, line 15, and going down to page 93, line 4. It does not apply to the Jones-Bankhead farm tenancy program.

Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the opinions expressed by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Georgia, that the consideration of the bill should be concluded today. I intend to make my remarks in support of the amendment I have offered as brief and concise as possible, and I shall ask that if there are any questions which any Senator desires to ask me, they be deferred until the conclusion of my initial statement.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to inquire simply about the scope of his substitute?

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. BONE. Does it cover everything from page 89 to the end of the committee amendment? I simply inquire in order to obtain the correct information.

Mr. BYRD. Down to line 4 on page 93.

Mr. BONE. It does not touch the text of the bill on page 93, under the term "farm tenancy"; does it?

Mr. BYRD. No; it does not. As the Senator will recall, the committee amendment, upon motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], was divided yesterday.

Mr. President, the Farm Security Administration, with which the pending amendment deals, has never been authorized by Congress. It may be called a \$1,000,000,000 bureau of the Government because this is approximately the amount of its expenditures, loans, and grants since its creation.

This is exclusive of the farm tenant program.

Mr. President, I would not deny a single dollar to the small-income farmers, provided that the loans are based upon proper and sound considerations. The amendment proposed by me would utilize other agencies of the Government that are already organized and that are operating successfully to aid the farmers of small incomes at a great saving of administrative cost.

This amendment I will discuss in detail later.

My attention was first attracted to the Farm Security Administration in the investigation of nonessential Federal expenditures by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This committee was directed by legislative enactment to make

a full and complete study and investigation of all the expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report at the earliest practicable date to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations. Last year an exhaustive investigation was made by the joint committee of the exact activities of the Farm Security Administration. I believe the hearings lasted for more than 10 days.

That report was signed without reservation by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia; the vice chairman, Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, who is chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means; the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Representative WOODRUM of Virginia, ranking Democratic member of the House Appropriations Committee; THOMAS H. CULLEN, ranking Democratic member of the House Ways and Means Committee; ALLEN T. TREADWAY, ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee; and JOHN TABER, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures approves of any sound and proper plan to improve the condition of the low-income farmers; but for reasons which are given, this committee believed—and made a report accordingly—that such activities could be much better administered by the other established bureaus of the Department of Agriculture.

During the period from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the administrative cost of the Farm Security Administration was \$275,861,889, in order to spend or give away \$714,092,031. In other words, it cost \$1 to loan or give away \$3.

I wish to read to the Senate the breakdown of that administrative cost.

The Farm Security Administration personnel in that period cost the Government, in round figures, \$198,000,000; supplies and materials cost \$30,000,000; rental for equipment, buildings, and land cost \$9,000,000; communications cost \$2,356,000; traveling expenses, including subsistence during that period, cost \$28,769,000; printing and binding cost \$1,844,000; advertising, \$30,000; heat, light, power, water, and electricity, \$759,000; miscellaneous costs were \$2,447,000, making a total of \$275,000,000 in round figures. During that period loans and grants were made to the extent of \$714,000,000.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The figure \$28,000,000 for traveling expenses, which was cited by the Senator from Virginia, amazes the hearer. Has the Senator any breakdown of that figure?

Mr. BYRD. There is no break-down, except that it was for traveling expenses.

Mr. TOBEY. Was it for travel by motorcar or train, or both? How could it be possible for the agency to spend \$28,000,000 for traveling expenses in one fiscal year?

Mr. BYRD. It is not for one fiscal year. It is for the period April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941. The traveling expenses for a single year, last year, were \$5,079,804.

Mr. TOBEY. Even that figure hits us in the face. It seems incongruous and an abnormality.

Mr. BYRD. The committee thought it was extremely excessive.

Of course, that includes what is called subsistence, which is part of the traveling expenses—in other words, hotel expenses and meals during the time the employees were traveling.

As of December 31, the Farm Security Administration had 15,960 employees, with an annual pay roll of about \$30,000,000. The traveling expenses for this fiscal year will be \$5,079,804. In addition, \$230,650 was spent for communications—telephone services and telegrams.

This organization maintains 47 State offices, 275 district offices, and 2,315 county offices, making a total of 2,637 offices. It operates these separate and distinct offices side by side with other agencies who are doing more or less similar work.

I now wish to discuss the resettlement projects. I know that they were begun under Mr. Tugwell. They were the Tugwellian experiments, the most costly experiments that have ever been conducted in this country, based upon the Russian form of communism. They were started by Mr. Tugwell, and the same theories which were then advocated by Mr. Tugwell have to a large extent permeated the Farm Security Administration in its other activities.

Those resettlement projects cost originally \$137,502,000. In addition, large sums were spent for development. Of course, I understand that those projects have proved to be so impracticable and so impossible of operation that the Resettlement Administration has abandoned them, but on the other hand, the Administration is attempting to operate a system of cooperative farms which is a program somewhat along the same line.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me whether or not a single one of those communal farms has ever been liquidated?

Mr. BYRD. I could not say that definitely, Mr. President. I think that practically none of the resettlement projects has been completely liquidated, except to the extent of being transferred, as I shall explain in a few moments, to some other agency of the Government. So far as I know, the cooperative farms have not been liquidated.

Mr. President, I wish to make some reference to the so-called liquidation of

these projects. Take the Arthurdale homesteads, a pet project of the wife of the President of the United States. Let us see what has happened in that case. The Arthurdale homesteads cost exactly \$2,744,724. They have been partially liquidated, to the extent of \$175,000, but my information is that the Government has secured nearly all the cash it will get out of them. So far as the records which I have been able to obtain are concerned, they show that only \$175,000 has been collected by the Government from this costly experiment which was proposed and sponsored by the wife of the President of the United States.

Let us take some of the other projects to show the method of liquidation which we are told is now going forward. As of June 30, 1942—and that is the latest figure I have been able to obtain—projects with a total capital investment, in round figures—and I shall use round figures to save time—of \$42,000,000 have been sold for \$11,000,000. Some of them have not been wholly sold. Practically none of these projects has been completely liquidated.

Sixty projects of a value of \$65,860,000 have been transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority. What they call liquidation is actually the transferring of these projects to some other agency of the Government where they will be administered at great cost, and will still add to the deficit which has occurred with respect to these projects.

Let us consider a few of the projects listed here:

In Alabama there are the Gees Bend farms. They cost \$408,264. So far they have been practically liquidated. They have been sold with receipts of about \$128,000.

Take the Skyline farms, in Alabama, on which an investment was made of \$1,260,000—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. To what year is the Senator referring?

Mr. BYRD. This is a report up to—

Mr. LUCAS. When was the Skyline farms project initiated?

Mr. BYRD. I do not have that date. I imagine that most of these projects were initiated in 1934, 1935, and 1936—at about that period.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the thing we have been hearing about for the last 4 or 5 or 6 years.

Mr. BYRD. The same thing.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with the early experiments which the Government conducted along that line.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, and they are continuing somewhat the same experiments under a different name, called cooperative farms, which are practically the same as the original resettlement projects. I wish to point out how costly and impractical the experiments have been, and what little value there is left in these projects by reason of the inefficient management which was given to the projects by the Resettlement Administration which was the predecessor of the Farm Security Administration.

In Arkansas—to read just a few of these—consider the Plum Bayou project in which \$1,625,000 was invested. That project has been partially liquidated, only partially, it is true, but the F. S. A. has received \$72,000 for that liquidation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the Senator from Virginia tell us what percent of that project has been liquidated?

Mr. BYRD. As to that particular one in Arkansas, only a small percentage of it has been liquidated. They have 180 units, and 17 were liquidated.

I will take another one in the Senator's State, the Lake Dick project. That project cost \$667,599. There has been practically no liquidation as yet. We have the report from the Farm Security Administration that only 26 families are now being housed on that project which cost approximately \$667,000. The Senator is no doubt familiar with that project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I am. In that connection I wish to say that I want to see these projects to which the Senator is directing his remarks absolutely liquidated, and abolished. I think they have been costly and impracticable in my State, and I do not want to support any measure that will continue them.

Mr. BYRD. I imagine the Senator prefers cash liquidation rather than the transfer of these projects to some other agency of the Government, as is being done by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator that I do. I think they ought to be completely abolished.

Mr. BYRD. Up to June 30, 1942, \$65,000,000 out of \$135,000,000 of the original cost of these projects was transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority where the cost will of course continue as far as the Government is concerned. The operating costs of maintenance of these projects as of the date of these figures which I am reading is \$1,877,000 a year, in addition to their original cost.

Take the Roanoke farms. I can furnish any Senator who wants it information concerning the projects of any State. I have an itemized statement which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD. The Roanoke farms, in North Carolina, regarding which there was a publication yesterday in the Washington Post, cost \$2,225,000. Mr. James I. Hicks, investigator for the House committee studying the Farm Security Administration, testified before the committee that the Government could give each of these occupants \$3,500, or give these projects to the occupants, and save to the Treasury one and a quarter million dollars.

That same thing exists, Mr. President, all through these projects.

Here is Oregon, in which \$1,313,000 was expended on a project, which was liquidated to the extent of \$163,000.

Indiana: The Wabash farms represent an investment of \$1,241,000, with

no liquidation as of the date of this report.

South Carolina: The Ashwood plantation, an investment of \$1,919,000, with no liquidation.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume the time of the Senate in reading these figures, but I should like to ask that these data, which have been prepared by the Farm Security Administration, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, as far as I can see, there is no provision in this bill providing for a mandatory or immediate liquidation and sale of these projects. It is true that the committee expresses the hope that they will be liquidated, but I think before we pass the pending measure, Mr. President, we should direct the Farm Security Administration not to transfer these projects to other agencies of the Government, but to sell them for what they are worth and take the loss. There is no better time than now and probably there will not be a better time to sell property for many years. Let us get rid of every one of the overhead expenses and administration costs which are constantly piling up the loss which the Government has already suffered in these very costly experiments that were advocated by Mr. Tugwell.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell us anything about the farms recently bought as a matter of relocating farmers who have been ousted by defense works? It seems to me that in that case we also have farms which are apparently not being sold or liquidated in any way.

Mr. BYRD. I do not have the exact figures, but the Senator is aware that there is such a program.

Mr. TAFT. In 1941 two assistant regional directors of the F. S. A. from Indianapolis, and the State director of the Farm Security Administration at Columbus, Ohio, formed an Ohio corporation called the Ohio Defense Relocation Corporation. They have gone out in Ohio and spent \$1,550,000 to purchase 15,650 acres of land. This is no old proposition. This has been done within 2 years. On that land they have relocated about 156 families, and apparently not one acre of the land has been sold, and no contracts of sale have been made. I may be misinformed, but that is the information that was given me in Columbus. It seems to me an extraordinary project for the Farm Security Administration, in the first place, to form a corporation. I do not know that they have any right to form corporations, although they have done so in all these States, whether to escape audit, or for what purpose, I do not know. Then that corporation goes out and buys 15,000 acres of land, and spends a million dollars and just holds on to it and rents it to people who are relocated from

defense areas. Those are all the facts I know about the situation, but it seems to me it is something which requires an explanation.

Mr. BYRD. Undoubtedly, that is going on in many sections of the country; but the Comptroller General not long ago refused to approve some of the appropriations.

Mr. TAFT. I am told that the purchase of this land was finally stopped because the Comptroller General ruled that the use in that way, at least through the Corporation, was not justified under any law of Congress, and, consequently, the further purchase has been stopped; but, so far as I can see, there is no immediate intention to liquidate at a time when presumably liquidation would be fairly easy.

Mr. BYRD. Not only is there no attempt to liquidate, but, as I understand, the program is continuing.

The Comptroller General found the Farm Security Administration guilty in 1942 of using these funds illegally to buy large tracts of land throughout the United States for the purpose of subdividing them into family units and then reselling them to Farm Security Administration clients, to be resettled in Farm Security Administration colony.

There is another vast resettlement program to which I desire to refer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I regret that I have not heard the entire discussion of the Senator from Virginia, but I should like to inquire if the Senator has referred to the number of agencies that are now engaged in the loaning of money to the farmers.

Mr. BYRD. I will say that there are 20 agencies engaged directly or indirectly in making loans to farmers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Twenty such agencies?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; 20 such agencies.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would consolidate, at least to the extent of the particular agency under consideration, two of those agencies for that purpose, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from West Virginia, it would consolidate two agencies that are already doing such work, the Farm Credit Administration and the Emergency Feed and Crop Loan Administration, which are already making practically the same type of loans that the Farm Security Administration is making.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The result would be that overhead expense in operating those agencies would be curtailed, the farmer would get the same benefit or even greater benefit, and certainly there would be greater efficiency of administration by a consolidation of these agencies.

Mr. BYRD. There is no question about that, for the Farm Security Administration has 15,000 employees, and, as I have stated to the Senate, has 2,300

different offices located throughout the country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Furthermore, it would mean the dismissal or release from the pay roll of numerous employees of the Government, as a natural result, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. It certainly should and unquestionably would.

In regard to cooperative farming which has been undertaken by the Farm Security Administration in practically every instance that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures of which I am chairman has been able to investigate, it has been a colossal failure. It is based on the Russian principle that a group of cooperative farmers should farm a tract of land, each having proportionate ownership. I desire to read to the Senate a statement made by the Appropriations Committee of the House in its report last year:

The Farm Security Administration is also carrying on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appears to resemble the plan of collective farming in communistic Russia.

This was the official report made by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives—

The committee believes that this is wholly contrary to the spirit and genius of the American way of life, and ought to be stopped.

Mr. President, at a regional conference of the F. S. A. officials in Columbus, Ohio, in 1941, and again at another conference in 1942, a circular explaining the F. S. A. program was placed before the conference. The circular was printed at the expense of the Farm Security Administration. Before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Mr. Baldwin admitted it was furnished by the F. S. A. officials, and, while he expressed general approval of the objectives, he said he disclaimed any responsibility for the document.

I wish to read to the Senate some of the testimony in respect to that. This document, which has been under consideration by the Farm Security Administration and the ideas of which they have been attempting to sell to the country and to sell to their clients, provides among other things:

For transferring surplus families from overpopulated areas so that the remaining families may be self-supporting.

Creating economic farm units by combining units that are now too small to maintain a family on an acceptable level of living.

Subdividing large holdings which are capable of supporting a large number of farmers on a satisfactory level of living.

Minimum rural housing standards.

Minimum wages for agricultural workers. Homestead exemption laws drawn in such a manner as to protect the family type farm.

In other words, make the family type farm the unit to be exempted. That, of course, would necessitate a change in the State laws and, in many instances, a change in State constitutions, because, in Virginia, for example, and in other States, the revenue of the State or locality comes directly from the taxation of land and tangible personal property.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in that part of the document just quoted by the Senator referring to dividing up large holdings of lands, whose holdings are referred to?

Mr. BYRD. I am coming to that later. They propose to acquire the holdings by the use of eminent domain and then distribute them, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do they propose to use eminent domain to acquire anybody's property they may select or desire, and then cause it to be divided?

Mr. BYRD. That was the suggestion made in the circular which has been under consideration. I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask whether the Farm Security Administration or any other similar agency of the Government could exercise the right of eminent domain without the consent of the State?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it could, but I am merely stating what the Farm Security Administration has in mind in this gigantic resettlement project for which it is attempting to create sentiment throughout the country.

Mr. AIKEN. To that extent the States do have control over the situation?

Mr. BYRD. Assuming that the Constitution is as we think it is, and that the Supreme Court will so construe it to be. As I have said, there is to be an exemption from taxation of family-type farms.

The document further proposes—

To exercise the rights of public (eminent) domain as a means of securing the subdivision of large landholdings into family-type farms. To compensate owners of such large holdings on the basis of earning-capacity values.

To expand cooperating farm leasing and purchasing associations as rapidly as experience justifies.

To acquire Government title to such land as is possible.

To retain land now being held by the Government.

That was presented, Mr. President, to the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Mr. Baldwin was examined with respect to it. There was no denial of the fact that this document had been printed at Government expense; on the face of it, the document came from the Farm Security Administration, and, while Mr. Baldwin, as I have said—and his testimony is on page 869 and the following pages of the committee report—disclaimed responsibility for it, he did not disclaim his general approval of the objectives of this socialistic and communistic scheme which the Farm Administration has undertaken to sell to the people of this country by reason of meetings and conferences.

I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss it further, but if any Member

of the Senate is interested in it, a full examination of Mr. Baldwin appears in the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

A little later a Land Policy Review was issued by the United States Department of Agriculture over the signature of Mr. Paul V. Maris, Director of the Tenant Purchasing Division of the Farm Security Administration. This is practically along the same line, and was discussed at another meeting held at the Hamilton Hotel in Washington, D. C., in January 1942.

This is an amazing document. It provides an agricultural blueprint of what is evidently intended to carry out the aims of Dr. Tugwell, "to make America over," to socialize American agriculture and industry, to regulate all industry and agriculture by one central authority.

To achieve these farm-tenure objectives, the F. S. A. committee report proposed to develop 10,500,000 acres of irrigable land at a total construction cost, including materials and labor, of approximately \$3,000,000,000; 20,000,000 acres of additional drainable land at a total cost, including materials and labor, of approximately \$1,000,000,000; an additional 20,000,000 acres of crop land to be cleared at a total cost, including materials and labor, of \$900,000,000; the construction of over 500,000 new farm-building units on reclaimed land, at a total cost of \$1,500,000; the construction of 1,000,000 new farm-building units in subdivisions and enlarged units at an average cost of \$3,000 a unit, or a total cost of \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, that was the program. The United States Government today owns 20 percent of all the land in this country. When we include the public domain and the land which has been acquired or is pending acquisition by the Federal Government alone, including the recent additions which have been acquired by the War Department, the Government at Washington owns 20 percent of all the land in the United States, and day by day the War Department and the Navy Department are increasing tremendously their holdings, during the emergency, without attempting to utilize to the extent they should, in my opinion, the existing land already owned by the United States Government.

The War Department alone, according to a report which the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will shortly submit to the Congress, has acquired or has pending acquisition in recent months, since the emergency began, nearly 20,000,000 acres of land, I think it is a very dangerous thing to continue to add to the ownership of land under the management and direction of the Federal Government.

I have discussed the resettlement program, and to some extent cooperative farming, and the objectives of this organization; let us not forget that every day the 15,000 agents and employees of the Farm Security Administration are going throughout this country attempting to sell these ideas to the people of

America, doing so by public meetings, and in many other ways.

I wish to call attention to something which occurred last year, when the document which I hold in my hand was printed by the Farm Security Administration and was circulated under frank by this Administration. That was proven beyond any question. The matter circulated was from the New Republic, and is entitled "Who Speaks for the Farmers?"

I mention this because I want the Senate to know that this organization of the Government is using the Government frank and Government money to denounce Senators because they have had the temerity to question anything the Farm Security Administration has done. These are just a few words I wish to quote:

When Senator BYRD called his fellow Virginian, C. B. Baldwin, Federal Security Administrator, before the committee, Mr. Baldwin testified that the Federal Security Administration was approving loans to clients who needed money to pay present or back poll taxes.

Mr. Baldwin is my constituent; he comes from the State of Virginia. I have no quarrel whatever with him, except I think he is the most inefficient and the most irresponsible head of any division of this Government. I have said that to him, and I will repeat it anywhere in the State of Virginia, although he is my constituent and I have had no quarrel whatever with him of a political character. His family has always supported me in my political career, beginning with the time when I was a candidate for Governor. This is what the document says:

The Byrd committee's all-star cast of Senators from poll-tax States were horrified by such brazen belief in constitutional guaranties, and CARTER GLASS was quick to assert that if the Department of Agriculture Solicitor agreed that such procedure was legal, Mr. Baldwin had better get himself a new solicitor.

As a matter of fact, it is against the constitutions of these Southern States to advance money to anyone to pay his poll tax; it is specifically and definitely prohibited by the constitutions of these States. Then it is said:

Senators MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, and GEORGE, of Georgia, made equally determined noises to indicate that tenants and croppers are not going to be forced to own their own farms, paint their houses, or feed their children balanced diets so long as they are in the Senate to ward off such a fate.

There are two pages of like denunciations of Senators, distributed under the franking privilege of the United States Government, and at the cost of the Government.

Mr. President, that is the type of organization the Farm Security Administration is.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate than necessary. I now come to the rehabilitation program of the Farm Security Administration. Mr. Baldwin testified before the Senate Agricultural Committee that his agency had loaned in rehabilitation loans approximately \$560,000,000. No one can foresee

or estimate the ultimate loss to the Government by reason of these loans because of the methods by which this organization conducts its affairs.

Mr. Baldwin testified before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures about a year ago that he estimated a loss of 20 percent, which would be \$110,000,000 on the total loans of \$550,000,000. Yet the assertion has been made that the clients of the Farm Security Administration are current and that they have paid their loans as they become due, in the main.

The fact is, and Mr. Baldwin has admitted it, that he makes additional loans to these clients. He makes loans when the clients are unable, as they are in many instances, to pay the installments which are due. He makes additional loans, and he furthermore has the right to make grants, to which I have not yet referred.

I wish to call attention to pages 1659 and 1660 of the House hearings on the 1944 bill. In response to an inquiry from Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. Baldwin said:

The rule we follow on that is this: If the borrower is going to continue on the program but has not met all of his installments—most of them have met most of their installments throughout the country—we take a new note.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The new note makes him current; does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN, at this meeting of the committee, said:

Every time there is a maturity that has not been paid, for a given annual installment, you make a new note?

Mr. BALDWIN. Not in each instance * * *. The rule we follow on that is this: If the borrower is going to continue on the program * * * we take a new note.

Then Mr. DIRKSEN said:

The new note makes him current?

And Mr. Baldwin replied:

Yes, sir; it does.

In addition to taking a new note in order to make them current when they have obligations which have not been paid, he continues to make additional loans, time and time again, to his clients.

I have some data here from Alabama. A man named Sandy Garrett who lives at Childersburg, Ala., received \$202.65 in grants. That is one of the ways many of these loans are made current. Mr. Baldwin makes grants, as well as loans. Mr. Garrett repaid only \$27.79 of his indebtedness, and was then given a new loan of \$274.

Mr. Ed Lewis of Hale County, Alabama, borrowed \$2,406 but repaid only \$163, and during this period he received grants totaling \$380—more than twice the amount of his total payments.

Britt Wages received 18 loans totaling \$2,224.

J. M. White received 18 loans totaling \$2,628, and then paid back only \$511.

I will not read more of these cases, because any amount of such data is available.

Mr. President, one of the objections, as I see it, to the Farm Security Administration, is that it puts farmers into debt

to the extent that they cannot pay the debt. I wish to read from the record of the hearings the basis on which many of these loans are made. They are made, Mr. President, for the purpose, and it was so admitted by Mr. Baldwin, of attending moving pictures. The Farm Security Administration regards that as a standard of living. Loans could be made for the purpose of joining the Knights of Pythias or the Masons. What I now say is based on evidence in response to questions which were asked Mr. Baldwin by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I shall have that part of the record looked up, and shall read it to the Senate later.

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by me provides that these activities shall be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration and the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

The Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section is now making loans to more than 1,000,000 low-income farmers. It has done a magnificent work. I think all Senators present will agree with that statement. In fact it has made 1,491,655 loans, including 167,405 drought loans. This organization has personnel in every part of the United States, in every county. My amendment provides that the Extension Service shall be utilized; that the farm agents shall be utilized. We have a farm agent in every county, as Senators know, and if this proposal were adopted it would greatly simplify and coordinate the work which is now being performed by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator from Virginia figures to show what percentage of feed loans have been paid back?

Mr. BYRD. The feed loans have been operated extremely efficiently, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina. The cost of servicing each loan of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section is \$2.54, whereas the cost to the Farm Security Administration for servicing each loan is \$46.07.

Mr. SMITH. The reason I asked the question is that there has been a difference between the collections made in certain regions. In the South and the Southwest I am informed about 97 percent of the loans have been repaid.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Under certain weather conditions in the West, by reason of which the farmers do not have the wherewithal to repay the loans, they have not repaid them.

Mr. BYRD. My information is that the average of repayment has been very high. Of course, drought loans are likewise made by the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has the Senator from Virginia figures showing what percentage of subsistence loans have been repaid by farmers?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean rehabilitation loans?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not think the repayment statistics amount to anything at all because, as I have just explained, Mr. Baldwin testified that when the loans become in arrears they simply gave new notes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understood from Mr. Baldwin's testimony that only 25 percent of the rehabilitation loans had been repaid in full.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Baldwin admitted to the committee that there was a loss of 20 percent on the original loans.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Baldwin was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a short time ago. The Senator from Virginia stated, I believe, that 80 percent of the Farm Security loans have been repaid. I presume that is 80 percent of the amount due.

Mr. BYRD. No; what I said was that Mr. Baldwin testified that his loss would be 20 percent. I think his loss is going to be very much greater.

Mr. AIKEN. Those figures are over a year old, are they not?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a fact that these small farmers are a little better off during the past year, because they have gotten better prices, and that many of them have gone to work in machine shops and received more money.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Baldwin testified that there would be a loss of 20 percent on the original loan.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time, between 82 and 85 percent of the loans which have become due have been paid back, and it is estimated that the amount paid back will be nearly 90 percent. So that the loss will not be nearly so great as was anticipated a year ago.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but I do not agree with the Senator from Vermont with respect to the fact that the loans are current, because Mr. Baldwin testified that when the loans become in default he frequently accepted new notes, and then regarded those loans as being current. That is shown in his testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; but do not some of our big businessmen and big corporations do the same thing? Why should we criticize the little fellow with the \$200 loan?

Mr. BYRD. I am not criticizing that. My criticism is based on the fact that Mr. Baldwin said that his loans are current; when a loan becomes in arrears, and a new note is taken for it, it does not thereby become current. That is not the proper way to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. If it is proper for the big businessman or corporation to follow such a practice, is it not proper for the F. S. A. to do so?

Mr. BYRD. What I am speaking of is whether such a loan is current or not. Mr. Baldwin testified that he simply gives a new note when a loan becomes in arrears, and then calls that loan current.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do that in connection with its operations?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Vermont perhaps knows more about that than I do. I spoke of what Mr. Baldwin said. Let me read to the Senate the testimony of Mr. Baldwin with respect to the basis upon which he makes these loans. It has already been called to the Senate's attention that he makes loans with which to pay poll taxes, but it is further testified that he has made no loans to Negroes to pay poll taxes in the South. Why that was, I do not know. He made them to the white people only.

I now read from the hearings before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Senator McKellar. Do you include movie tickets, tickets to the movies, for proper recreation?

Mr. Baldwin. No, sir. This is a miscellaneous column there that might include such an item. I think these people are privileged to go to the movies; yes.

Senator McKellar. So you would include the movies. Would you include the travel expenses to town, for a chance of recreation in the city nearby?

Mr. Baldwin. Well, I think, sir, the rule of reason would be followed. These families are poor families. They have the same likes and dislikes, I guess, as most of us have.

Senator McKellar. Would you include the Knights of Pythias dues, and Masonic dues, and chamber of commerce dues, and things like that?

Mr. Baldwin. These items are the normal cost that go toward living in a democracy.

Senator McKellar. That would be normally included under the new democracy?

That is the basis for my statement, Mr. President, that many of these loans have been made on that ground. I am not going to take up more of the time of the Senate. I think we must face fairly and squarely the situation, Senators, that there should be a reduction of these bureaus of the Government which are duplicating work of other bureaus of the Government. We have 20 different agencies making agricultural loans of one kind or another. I know of no better place to start to coordinate and consolidate the activities of the Government than in these agencies which are making loans to the farmers, and I know of no better place to start than to adopt the amendment which has been offered by me, which is the same amendment as was proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, the same amendment which was proposed in the House after very careful consideration and stricken out there on a point of order. I know of no better way to start than for the Senate to adopt the amendment and consolidate the activities of the Farm Security Administration with the Farm Credit Administration and the facilities which are already established in the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. President, I shall conclude with one further statement. In the course of the debate we have heard a great deal of criticism of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am not one who has by any means blindly agreed with opinions and followed the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation. On the contrary, I think I have

voted against their recommendations perhaps more frequently than I have voted for them. However, let me here and now pay my tribute to that great organization of farmers for having performed and for performing now one of the best jobs which has been done or is being done for the farmers of America. When it is said that the American Farm Bureau Federation does not represent the small-income farmers of the country I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the magazine *Fortune* conducted a survey not long ago, and as a result found that 60 percent of all organized farmers are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is the largest farm organization in America today. The survey showed that 60 percent of the high-income farmers are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that 61 percent of the medium-income farmers are members of the Federation, and that 48 percent of the low-income farmers who are organized are members of it. The federation advocates the amendment which was proposed by the House Appropriations Committee and which has been offered by the Senator from Virginia. I offer no apologies whatever for offering to the Senate this amendment, which comes from the greatest farm organization in this country, an organization which represents in its membership more low-income agricultural producers than does any other farm organization in existence. I believe that Mr. O'Neal and the other men who have charge of that great farm organization are now looking at the question from the standpoint of what is best for the farmers and what will be best for them after the conclusion of the war, when, in my judgment, the farmers will be faced with the most serious conditions, after Europe has caught up with its food supplies, ever to be confronted by them. The American Farm Bureau Federation is now attempting to simplify all the various agencies dealing with farmers, so that the farmer will not become a servant of the bureaus in Washington, and so that the farmer's every action will not be controlled by the various Washington bureaus. The American Farm Bureau Federation is rendering the farmers a valuable service, in endeavoring to bring about a coordination and consolidation of the various governmental bureaus in the interests of the farmers of America.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator if he proposes to change the manner in which the feed loan is to be operated?

Mr. BYRD. I think the bill which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina, to increase the maximum from \$400 to \$800, as I understand, should by all means be passed, especially if this amendment is agreed to; and, if necessary, the amount should be increased above \$800. I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator's bill, which I understand is now pending in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

Mr. SMITH. I simply want to know if the amendment proposes a change in the method of handling the feed loans.

Mr. BYRD. It was not intended to change it.

Mr. SMITH. The language is:

To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision.

The feed loan activities come under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. So there will be no change; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. No change. There was no intention to make any change, and I am certain the amendment does not do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understood the Senator's remarks with reference to the liquidation of the projects which have been discussed, he stated that in the committee amendment to the bill he felt there was not sufficient or adequate direction to compel their liquidation.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I read the committee amendment and also the last paragraph of the amendment which the Senator is now offering, it seems to me they are practically the same. Practically the same language is used.

Mr. BYRD. I am glad the Senator reminded me. I have an amendment as follows:

On page 95, line 11, insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of the appropriation authorized under this item shall be used except for the complete liquidation of the Resettlement projects which shall be accomplished by December 31, 1943."

That amendment would go in on page 95, where appropriation of \$421,039 is made to carry out the liquidation and management of resettlement projects. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is offering an amendment which will place a limit on the time during which the projects must be liquidated; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is correct in his statement. Certainly, the pending amendment of the Senator from Virginia does not cover that matter, and I do not think the committee amendment adequately covers it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Am I to understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is a substitute for the committee amendment which was agreed to yesterday?

Mr. BYRD. The committee amendment was not agreed to yesterday, let me say to the Senator. My amendment is a substitute for that part of the committee amendment beginning on page 89, line 15, and extending down to and including line 4 on page 93.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator advise me whether the sum total of appropriations included in his substitute

amendment is less or more than the total included in the amendment for which his is proposed as a substitute?

Mr. BYRD. I will say it is substantially less. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia provides for administrative expenses of \$12,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be available to the extension services of the land-grant colleges, and so forth. Let me explain to the Senator the reason why the amount is reduced so substantially. Because the committee amendment provides for the same expenses of \$29,607,573; the Senator from Virginia feels that if the other organizations are utilized there can be a saving in administrative expenses to that extent; and then the loans are reduced from \$97,500,000 to \$40,000,000.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The amount which might be available for the farmers has also been reduced by the Senator's amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. It has been reduced. Let me say to the Senator that there are a number of new agencies making loans to the farmers. One of them is the R. A. C. C., which recently was organized. It makes nonrecourse loans of approximately \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, next week a bill to abolish that agency will be pending.

Mr. BYRD. It is not abolished in the pending bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Then, Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to, it will mean that, while the functions are transferred to another division of the Government, yet the amount available to the farmers for the purposes enumerated will be reduced by more than \$40,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The amount for loans is proposed to be reduced from \$97,500,000 to \$40,000,000. The latter is the amount which the House Appropriations Committee, after long hearings and careful consideration, regarded as adequate. I think everyone will recognize that the administrative expenses can and should be reduced, if the proposed consolidation with existing agencies is made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator if, in his opinion, the other agencies of government to which his amendment would transfer the present functions of the Farm Security Administration are now sufficiently staffed, organized, and prepared so as to be able to carry on those functions. In other words, I should not want to have the functions of the Farm Security Administration and that part of the program having to do with the making of loans to small-income farmers abolished. I want to have it retained; and at this time I should not want to have made a transfer which might jeopardize that program.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that the \$12,000,000 appropriation for which provision is made, plus the funds those agencies already have, in my judgment will be adequate; because, as the Senator knows, the extension services and the emergency crop-and-feed loan agency now have organizations existing

all over the country, and it is proposed to use them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are they prepared and equipped to give comparatively the same quality of service in the way of guidance and instruction to small farmers?

Mr. BYRD. I think they are. In 1942 the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan organization made loans to more than 1,400,000 farmers which is nearly twice the amount of loans made by the Farm Security Administration. The Senator is familiar with the farm agents' organization. It is being utilized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In this connection, I do not feel that we ought completely to liquidate this program at this time, when food is so vital. I refer to the program for aiding and servicing the small income farmer. With respect to these projects, I think every one ought to be abolished. That is the way I wish to vote on the question, if it is presented in that form.

Mr. BYRD. In response to the Senator's question, let me say that the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan organization is servicing many more loans for the smaller farmer than is this organization. The total number of loans in 1942 was 1,491,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are those the seed and feed loans?

Mr. BYRD. It is the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section. It has an organization which can be expanded by the additional appropriation of \$12,000,000, which would be adequate, in my judgment, to take care of the program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's amendment would the other agency have the same authority as the F. S. A. has under existing law to carry on the work of the F. S. A. with regard to the servicing of the low-income farmers?

Mr. BYRD. It would have authority to make loans in the rural rehabilitation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Referring to grants, if the functions of this agency were transferred, as the Senator's amendment provides, would the new agency with which it would be consolidated have authority to make grants to farmers, we will say, in areas which have suffered tremendous damage from the disastrous floods which have recently occurred?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would have authority to make grants. It would have authority to make loans. It now makes drought loans, which are in the same class.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment provide for making grants as well as loans?

Mr. BYRD. The language of the amendment is:

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and Production Credit Associations, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to

needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, according to the Senator's interpretation of the amendment, it would authorize grants to farmers in flooded areas.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would. The limitation is as follows:

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wished to determine whether or not the other agency could make grants in flooded areas to rehabilitate farmers, as well as making loans to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to refrain from interrupting the Senator. He asked not to be interrupted; but I must say that when this amendment was proposed in the House, it was not contended that there was any authority for making grants. As a matter of fact, it was insisted that that authority be abolished. If the Senator will read the language, he will find that it refers only to rural re-

habilitation loans. There is no authority for making grants, no matter how grave the emergency may be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator referring to the committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The committee amendment permits grants.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to determine is the difference between the authority under the committee amendment and the authority under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about it. On page 7, in the committee amendment, there is specific authority, which has always been carried, for making grants in case of disaster. That is found under subdivision (3).

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the way I interpreted the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Those grants are made from the \$29,000,000 to which the Senator from Virginia refers as administrative expenses; but under the Senator's amendment there would be available only \$4,000,000 for handling the \$450,000,000 in loans which are outstanding, as well as for making new loans of \$40,000,000. The other \$8,000,000 would go to the Extension Service. There is no fund in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia which could possibly be used for grants.

Mr. BYRD. What I tried to make clear to the Senator is that the amend-

ment does not provide for making grants, but it does provide for rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers. That provision is found on page 2 of my amendment, beginning in line 13.

My amendment would enable the Secretary—

to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption, "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation.

With respect to what the Senator from Georgia has just said as to the administrative cost, it is intended to utilize existing machinery of other agencies, which would not necessitate anything like the administrative cost of the 15,000 employees now carried by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wished to get the matter clear in my own mind. Ordinarily I would not favor the grant provision in the law as it has existed in the past; but in my State and in many others an emergency exists, which has been brought about by the recent floods. I think it is necessary that some provision be made for grants to farmers in order to rehabilitate them and put them back on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. BYRD. That could be easily done by emergency legislation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is permanent legislation.

EXHIBIT I

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942

RECAPITULATION BY TYPE

Description	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Projects sold or partially sold.....	\$42,927,423.35	5,982	\$34,482,431.58	\$5,764.36	3,099	\$11,904,862.76	\$4,389.70	\$670,312.67	\$255,579.79	\$185,129.07	\$79,278.71	\$19,987.57	5354,271.75
Projects on which no units have been sold.....	27,618,406.57	3,154	21,096,146.43	6,688.69				392,857.28	173,665.61	84,065.08	37,644.18	295,374.87	203,966.44
Projects undeveloped.....	1,148,611.64	74				47,100.00		32,413.85	10,132.33	5,222.52	533.83	15,888.08	6,445.91
Projects transferred to Federal Public Housing Authority.....	65,808,271.69	5,483	41,940,861.09	7,649.25	1,427	3,332,240.94	2,335.13	1,552,664.74	707,897.09	309,914.36	28,193.90	1,046,005.35	205,077.09
Total.....	137,502,713.25	14,693	97,519,439.10	6,637.14	4,526	15,284,203.70	3,692.72	2,648,248.64	1,147,274.82	584,331.03	145,050.62	1,877,256.47	769,761.19

PROJECTS SOLD OR PARTIALLY SOLD

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Alabama:													
Gee's Bend farms.....	\$408,264.50	101	\$303,578.87	\$3,005.73	95	\$128,250.00	\$1,350.00	\$6,001.39	\$444.10			\$444.10	\$7,517.83
Prairie farms.....	200,935.89	36	140,315.15	3,897.64	34	115,532.00	3,398.00	2,379.44	1,062.73		\$46.00	1,108.73	6,247.97
Skyline farms.....	1,260,030.87	156	863,597.05	5,535.88	32	96,000.00	3,000.00	4,854.36	10,859.01			10,859.01	8,465.02
Arkansas:													
Arkansas Farm Tenant Security.....	513,297.56	66	393,289.43	5,958.93	16	78,564.00	4,910.25	10,985.49	2,966.15	\$317.62		3,283.77	4,304.48
Biscoe farms.....	371,935.47	74	334,409.51	4,519.03	69	296,382.00	4,295.39	8,345.06	835.67	33.77		869.44	6,783.25
Central and western Arkansas Valley farms.....	359,390.35	82	359,390.35	4,382.81	69	248,306.21	3,598.64	6,805.78	2,646.45	74.86	3,146.72	5,868.03	6,875.67
Chicot farms.....	1,050,864.80	89	514,130.29	5,776.74	30	92,722.07	3,090.74	1,272.30	215.11	5,884.42	62.89	6,162.42	10,820.98
Clover Bend farms.....	478,670.86	86	374,978.42	4,360.21	76	320,415.00	4,215.99	10,458.07	2,496.35	88.27	247.55	2,832.17	7,827.71
Desha.....	499,489.59	88	466,807.97	5,304.64	60	275,278.10	4,587.97	10,985.72	1,343.01	845.66		2,188.67	7,576.64
Lake Dick.....	667,599.36	89	297,566.47	3,343.44	8	36,550.00	4,568.75	19,632.92	3,499.82	420.04	4,178.00	8,097.86	7,050.40
Lakeview.....	602,742.57	140	679,287.49	4,852.05	52	212,770.00	4,091.73	24,257.84	7,049.87	471.87		7,521.74	9,334.33
Lonoke farms.....	249,873.37	41	191,856.68	4,679.43	39	184,474.64	4,730.12	5,455.21	775.16	60.79	1,099.44	2,895.39	5,230.99
Northwest Arkansas farms.....	214,320.60	44	214,320.60	4,877.88	30	124,550.40	4,151.68	3,620.44	2,923.18	77.17	1,717.96	4,718.31	6,765.61
Plum Bayou.....	1,629,716.77	180	1,172,266.60	6,512.59	17	72,255.00	4,250.29	26,270.46	8,191.68	1,251.01		9,442.69	14,560.37

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS SOLD OR PARTIALLY SOLD—continued

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
California: Mendocino resettlement project	\$25,175.00	4	\$11,750.00	\$2,937.50	4	\$11,599.00	\$2,899.90						\$21.50
Colorado:													
San Luis Valley farms	1,075,723.29	86	633,149.09	7,362.20	50	348,672.00	6,971.44	\$4,611.03	\$15,913.00	\$2,225.00	\$50.36	\$18,188.36	7,995.94
Western slope farms	1,146,877.01	103	982,153.19	9,535.47	31	220,585.66	7,115.67	17,349.07	3,849.33	15,894.00	4,014.37	23,757.70	8,251.82
Florida: Escambia	563,258.75	81	389,882.72	4,866.45	21	73,500.00	3,500.00	2,303.65	4,688.75			4,688.75	7,806.02
Georgia:													
Flint River farms	731,736.08	146	519,928.00	3,561.15	63	225,057.00	3,572.33	6,586.00	66.00			66.00	8,412.32
Georgia Farm Tenant Security	674,610.87	106	648,912.78	6,121.82	27	117,324.00	4,345.33	7,286.92	1,977.36		4,373.20	6,350.56	200.00
Idaho:													
Boundary farms	788,440.97	37	469,005.19	12,675.82	37	332,204.00	8,981.19	9,219.18			11.74	11.74	4,609.57
Idaho scattered farms	185,924.49	87	149,537.55	1,718.82	62	96,829.27	1,561.76	5,567.95		1,108.35	285.56	1,393.91	76.27
Kansas: Northeastern Kansas farms	243,382.55	26	224,728.24	8,643.39	8	81,576.00	10,197.00	1,145.96	2,976.54	2,387.42	1,653.04	7,017.00	3,342.70
Kentucky:													
Sublimity farms	441,386.14	66	350,928.66	5,317.10	(1)	(1)	(1)	4,608.82	2,824.00			2,824.00	
Christian-Trigg farms	971,429.33	103	877,098.17	8,515.52	41	306,492.79	7,475.43	22,803.88	4,897.39	4,000.32	6,660.38	15,558.09	8,717.94
Louisiana:													
Louisiana Farm Tenant Security	622,284.51	110	555,903.95	5,053.67	39	177,319.00	4,546.64	13,094.03	6,345.40	2,807.87	3,842.32	12,995.59	5,503.40
Mounds farms	867,723.12	145	525,090.46	3,621.31	2	12,181.00	6,090.50	10,354.30	365.17	6,035.99		6,401.16	
Transylvania farms	873,404.11	160	690,801.07	4,373.76	16	78,870.00	4,929.38	1,358.43	121.60	5,368.98	1,631.00	7,121.58	9,703.16
Maine: State of Maine farms	380,664.46	66	380,664.46	5,767.64	38	133,179.18	3,504.71	6,910.29	7,583.00		1,636.34	9,219.34	3,885.11
Michigan:													
Corporation farms and real estate	46,595.12	18	46,595.12	2,588.62	13	16,343.83	1,257.22	5,051.01					
Johannesburg farms	84,743.21	15	84,743.21	5,649.55	15	74,011.75	4,934.12						
Southern Michigan farms	554,563.31	72	554,563.31	7,702.68	27	169,662.00	6,283.78	10,462.72	5,251.28			5,251.28	
Minnesota:													
Albert Lea homesteads	46,315.25	14	46,315.25	3,308.23	14	30,257.71	2,161.27	2,452.09			665.20	665.20	
Central Minnesota farms	1,033,846.66	105	1,033,846.66	9,846.16	99	921,045.28	9,303.49	29,148.47	3,938.70		31.96	3,970.66	5,271.24
Ethan Allen	13,700.00	4	8,025.00	2,006.25	3	9,681.00	3,193.66						
Beltrami Island farms	493,654.41	214	493,654.41	2,306.80	214	480,278.84	2,244.29						
Minnesota scattered farms	3,978.00	3	3,978.00	1,326.00	3	3,603.68	1,201.23						
Mississippi:													
Hinds farms	271,289.91	73	249,151.42	3,413.03	59	199,693.00	3,384.63	5,900.45	1,141.76	985.00	2,405.92	4,532.68	7,845.66
Lucedale farms	460,740.04	93	407,525.25	4,381.99	64	162,000.00	2,531.25	7,204.72	683.62	1,450.00	3,463.52	5,597.14	6,382.54
Mississippi Farm Tenant Security	1,822,040.57	294	1,340,203.80	4,558.52	135	685,640.00	5,078.81	43,486.02	4,071.88	15,717.00	121.14	19,910.02	9,919.42
Northeast Mississippi farms	552,363.34	112	545,484.00	4,870.39	45	144,327.19	3,207.27	10,263.92	2,766.47	2,100.00	25.00	4,951.47	8,450.24
Missouri: Rehabilitation demonstration farms	149,163.72	51	149,163.72	2,924.78	4	3,589.00	897.25	12,559.73	648.99		57.62	706.61	
Montana:													
Fairfield Bench farms	1,159,571.51	129	1,096,191.88	8,497.61	89	348,572.00	3,916.54	13,160.21	10,472.00	15,750.00	8,781.57	35,003.57	7,854.62
Milk River farms	2,034,071.38	163	1,341,217.41	8,228.33	64	220,585.66	3,446.63	30,578.72	12,250.27	33,307.46	2.68	46,560.41	7,503.54
New York:													
Finger Lakes farms	433,515.32	55	433,515.32	7,882.10	35	189,335.14	5,409.58	10,782.01	8,263.00	1,473.00	5,185.25	14,921.25	4,312.18
New York Valley farms	273,012.30	34	273,012.30	8,029.77	22	121,812.57	5,536.94	7,696.40	2,233.83	1,137.68	3,551.75	6,923.26	2,076.36
North Carolina:													
North Carolina Farm Tenant Security	553,933.71	95	539,891.27	5,683.07	40	184,362.90	4,600.07	8,865.65	1,474.85	3,808.69	108.44	5,391.98	4,960.11
Pembroke farms	623,473.60	65	417,851.77	6,428.49	58	290,059.00	5,001.02	7,208.91	1,586.28	3,780.61	78.09	5,444.96	6,544.01
Roanoke farms	2,225,364.77	294	1,743,104.62	5,928.93	44	188,922.32	4,283.69	28,293.89	6,948.68	4,320.48	136.15	11,405.31	9,460.34
Scuppernon farms	796,016.04	49	392,966.64	8,019.72	20	118,190.00	5,900.50	5,614.96	8,949.59	4,739.73		13,680.32	9,020.75
Wolf Pit farms	274,493.51	37	202,738.41	5,479.42	29	131,280.00	4,526.90	1,685.27	152.75	1,240.66	4.77	1,398.18	2,913.29
North Dakota:													
Burlington project	212,867.31	35	143,361.27	4,096.04	1	5,050.00	5,030.00	859.29	2,663.80	308.31		2,962.11	3,797.58
Red River Valley farms	1,408,769.89	140	1,086,923.88	7,763.87	8	69,840.00	8,730.00	2,939.73	6,629.56	11,195.77	1.60	17,826.93	6,349.86
Oklahoma:													
Eastern Oklahoma farms	653,218.92	71	523,409.62	7,371.79	59	378,574.20	6,416.51	2,415.60	6,214.86	3,297.04	54.24	9,566.14	6,102.47
Oklahoma Farm Tenant Security	558,942.48	55	482,311.08	10,162.59	9	65,554.59	7,283.84	16,409.46	4,767.04	2,043.33	229.90	7,040.27	562.46
Oregon: Yamhill farms	1,313,533.81	104	1,256,682.72	12,083.58	22	163,218.00	7,419.00	21,964.03	12,347.94	3,033.05	6,568.19	21,919.18	6,919.95
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania farms	261,391.06	37	244,032.04	6,596.00	20	105,439.28	5,271.96	7,064.12	10,546.00	1,375.98	347.84	12,269.82	4,514.04
South Carolina:													
Allendale farms	600,253.20	117	554,929.51	4,742.99	1	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,449.71	4,510.45	2,344.00	2,248.00	9,102.45	7,961.98
Orangeburg farms	534,047.76	80	458,493.29	5,731.17	37	158,881.00	4,294.08	4,903.39	497.27	2,222.00	873.73	3,593.00	8,645.34
South Dakota: Eastern South Dakota farms	420,132.59	39	420,132.59	10,772.63	4	41,350.00	10,337.50	3,871.84	4,435.00	4,091.91		8,526.91	3,281.50
Tennessee: Tennessee Farm Tenant Security	903,982.93	137	739,646.74	5,398.88	52	230,198.15	4,426.89	14,837.38	4,107.89	5,014.00	7,063.80	16,187.69	7,627.70
Texas:													
Sabine farms	419,361.61	80	349,542.67	4,369.28	61	218,293.83	3,578.58	2,914.15	3,346.59			3,346.52	6,120.90
Sam Houston farms	614,061.83	86	504,406.17	5,865.19	17	94,755.47	5,573.83	6,625.34	7,185.01	2,859.27		10,044.28	6,753.73
Texas Farm Tenant Security	989,826.36	111	972,349.51	8,759.50	34	197,924.00	5,821.29	24,328.69	5,654.81	2,527.53	639.17	8,821.51	3,964.60
Utah:													
Sevier Valley farms	161,007.18	18	160,113.48	8,893.19	18	125,375.84	6,965.32	662.26		221.00		221.00	30.00
Widtsoe resettlement project	87,804.00	15	69,000.41	4,600.03	11	57,458.99	5,223.54	1,045.37			70.16	70.16	
Virgin Islands:													
St. Croix homesteads ¹					337								
St. Thomas homesteads ²					50								
Washington:													
Snohomish farms	497,070.08	44	497,070.08	11,297.03	41	368,048.00	8,976.78	8,503.68	4,608.86		582.34	191.20	5,450.37
Washington scattered farms	285,405.88	129	234,979.16	1,821.54	97	139,919.23	1,442.47	1,326.90	222.99	351.67	438.38	1,013.04	76.14
Wisconsin:													
Central Wisconsin farms	544,869.34	73	532,299.68	7,291.77	34	187,351.50	5,510.34	22,232.53	10,111.03	5,020.49	13.43	15,144.95	5,495.72
Lakewood-Crandon farms	144,640.50	24	144,640.50	6,026.69	24	95,038.80	3,959.95						
Total	42,927,423.35	5,982	34,482,431.58	5,764.36	3,099	11,904,862.16	4,389.70	670,					

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS ON WHICH NO UNITS HAVE BEEN SOLD

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942			Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	
Alabama:												
Alabama Farm Tenant Security	\$587,617.43	96	\$560,770.44	5,841.36			\$10,160.51	4,608.43		\$129.60	\$4,738.03	\$295.00
Alabama scattered farms	168,646.14	28	123,761.80	4,420.05			2,326.77	2,628.29		38.08	2,666.37	50.00
Coffee farms	1,893,593.66	299	1,372,851.47	4,591.48			25,886.83	20,330.33		2,062.21	22,392.54	15,250.03
Arizona: Casa Grande Valley farms	810,859.80	60	289,402.05	4,823.37			23,953.32	933.73	\$4,283.91	1,846.02	7,063.66	7,712.90
Arkansas:												
St. Francis River farms	501,606.53	86	337,854.75	3,928.54			27,948.03	3,848.68	5,663.07	1,640.00	11,157.75	4,404.82
Towness farms	172,477.50	31	127,874.44	4,124.98			6,296.32	195.50	710.51		906.01	4,404.64
Trumann farms	263,718.98	66	239,243.72	4,272.21			26,510.05	4,232.94	3,586.00	1,999.71	9,818.65	4,455.96
Florida: Florida scattered farms	394,159.47	69	394,159.47	5,712.46			4,660.45	671.79		470.00	1,141.79	6,767.20
Georgia:												
Briar patch farms	266,888.44	22	181,704.87	8,259.31			1,151.00	1,641.83		237.73	1,879.56	2,951.59
Georgia scattered farms	24,460.23	7	15,959.96	2,279.99			50.00			29.52	79.52	20.00
Greene County project	841,428.82	125	201,807.29	2,334.46			5,073.92			232.00	232.00	375.00
Irwinville	910,894.47	105	744,666.57	7,092.06			14,882.59	6,711.59		1,674.31	9,025.90	7,462.60
Piedmont homesteads	651,360.11	50	521,219.67	10,424.39			2,239.26	2,422.01	640.00		2,422.01	5,765.34
Wolf Creek	237,817.11	24	183,320.66	7,638.36			1,852.37	429.78			923.23	4,327.93
Indiana: Wabash farms	1,241,451.86	122	1,231,645.25	10,095.45			16,672.07	11,135.21		1,563.43	12,698.64	6,170.37
Kansas: Kansas scattered farms	67,005.44	7	67,005.44	9,572.21			1,230.02	642.00	629.03	721.87	1,992.90	5.00
Louisiana: Terrebonne	527,966.52	71	327,058.07	4,606.45				320.74	2,893.21		3,213.95	
Michigan: Cheboygan farms	15,858.41	3	15,858.41	5,286.14			90.00					
Minnesota: Thief River Falls farms	949,241.67	111	916,425.39	8,256.08			11,343.31	5,457.08		2.76	5,459.84	5,614.36
Mississippi:												
Mileston	831,403.28	106	666,001.18	6,283.03				85.60	9,244.39		9,329.99	7,417.62
Richton homesteads	215,599.95	26	183,490.31	7,057.32			768.34	770.98	970.67		1,741.65	1,417.48
Missouri:												
La Forge farms	779,406.94	101	666,550.51	6,599.51			22,103.16	11,933.77	38.87		11,972.64	5,607.11
Osage farms	965,236.37	86	519,682.43	6,042.82			14,732.28	4,589.87		7,948.23	12,538.10	6,040.78
Montana: Kinsey flats	737,652.46	80	622,814.13	7,785.18								7,554.15
Nebraska:												
Fairbury farmsteads	76,879.32	11	51,535.69	4,685.06			457.60	3,599.43	136.74	597.12	4,333.29	25.00
Falls City homesteads	102,572.20	10	41,544.20	4,154.42				82.00		252.83	693.68	1,028.51
Grand Island farmsteads	66,490.03	10	46,040.37	4,604.04			759.75	480.00	214.73	540.80	1,235.53	25.00
Kearney farmsteads	97,072.63	10	42,234.31	4,223.43			2,296.78	1,955.70	675.45	544.96	3,176.11	
Loup City farmsteads	102,625.54	11	49,758.27	4,523.48			96.78	1,133.39	1,608.82	800.94	3,543.15	70.00
Scottsbluff farmsteads	231,695.55	23	132,002.58	5,739.24			398.01	1,626.96	2,246.51	1,347.03	5,220.50	4,550.54
South Sioux City farmsteads	111,789.13	22	83,690.77	3,804.13			1,226.35	822.07	719.76	1,142.64	2,684.47	31.00
Two Rivers	544,050.66	40	286,525.14	7,163.13			60.00	2,675.06		831.43	4,906.49	4,792.54
New Mexico:												
Bosque	677,022.82	42	595,469.61	14,177.85			3,885.36	3,460.65	9,289.00		12,749.65	4,776.27
Dona Ana farms	34,467.82	5	34,467.82	6,893.56			2,621.76	55.00	414.07		469.07	
New Mexico farms	189,390.82	22	188,321.59	4,014.62			3,969.33	1,592.79			1,592.79	4,046.71
North Carolina:												
North Carolina scattered farms	174,633.43	25	174,633.43	6,985.37			3,912.58	2,534.03		101.94	2,635.97	3,294.70
Penderlea homesteads	2,277,080.37	186	1,486,149.42	7,990.05			10,857.03	12,359.41	4,162.08	3.55	16,525.04	13,293.94
North Dakota: North Dakota scattered farms	12,041.68	2	9,770.68	4,885.34					86.98		86.98	
Ohio:												
Scioto Farms	1,950,951.15	133	1,432,260.80	10,768.88			36,937.55	10,189.66		1.38	10,191.04	7,399.96
Oklahoma: 101 ranch farms	647,043.47	40	421,139.40	10,528.48			11,536.11	1,664.88	1,801.98	285.42	3,752.28	5,029.52
Pennsylvania: Northampton farms	149,234.86	6	148,395.38	24,732.58			4,962.02	819.00	455.63	449.08	1,723.71	1,086.87
South Carolina:												
Ashwood plantation	1,919,372.70	161	1,362,952.34	8,465.54			10,141.29	10,827.31	10,653.00	2.00	21,482.31	12,887.81
South Carolina Farm Tenant Security	445,943.57	55	420,041.54	7,637.12			3,442.66	2,349.80	2,358.00	1,922.00	6,629.80	125.00
South Carolina scattered farms	68,439.87	22	68,439.87	3,110.00			418.00	1,328.68	263.00	706.74	2,298.42	75.00
Tiverton farms	85,575.81	29	85,575.81	2,950.89			152.00	288.30	328.00	1,090.40	1,706.70	4,355.72
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	218,927.83	14	97,668.76	6,976.34			1,415.35	3,612.90		1,314.64	4,927.54	2,156.66
Texas:												
Fannin farms	269,696.92	38	286,483.19	6,223.24			5,482.58	956.27	945.75		1,902.02	4,970.99
Ropesville farms	668,677.42	76	641,038.19	8,434.71			34,224.10	6,903.70			6,803.70	5,536.45
Wichita Valley farms	928,733.94	91	807,670.07	8,875.50			15,147.89	6,588.82	12,582.30		19,171.12	6,357.22
Woodlake community	651,446.20	101	474,000.32	4,693.07			4,219.88	3,732.69		51.11	3,783.70	5,488.11
Virginia: Shenandoah homesteads	1,043,454.48	151	858,947.69	5,688.40			9,204.73	5,698.06	2,831.00	4,245.65	12,774.71	9,370.95
Wisconsin:												
Drummond Forest community	247,948.61	32	210,623.03	6,581.97	(1)	(1)	3,092.49	3,439.00			3,439.00	
Monroe County retirement	18,507.78	6	17,519.51	2,919.92			1,145.25					
Northern Pine retirement homesteads	20,118.37	9	20,118.37	2,235.37			863.45		548.36	278.40	826.76	25.60
Total	27,618,406.57	3,154	21,096,146.43	6,688.69			392,857.28	173,665.61	84,065.08	37,644.18	295,374.87	203,966.44

PROJECTS UNDEVELOPED

Alabama: West central Alabama farms	\$5,522.00											
Arkansas: Kelso farms	44,712.98								\$3,039.00		\$3,039.00	\$1,704.96
Colorado:												
Colorado scattered farms	2,102.00	1							79.65		79.65	
Las Animas farms	1,758.60											
Florida: Jacksonville homesteads	19,322.87				(1)	(1)	(1)					
Illinois: Southern Illinois homesteads	69,680.03											
Indiana: Rehabilitation demonstration farms	6,807.74	2										
Michigan:												
Au Sable area	21,049.88	1					\$171.50					
Potato warehouse	33,568.17						2,584.42	\$92.00			92.00	
Saginaw Valley	328,187.51	33					18,572.83	8,727.62	802.00		9,299.62	1,853.55

¹ Operated by Forest Service.

² Transferred to the Navy Department.

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS UNDEVELOPED—continued

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942			Management obligations, fiscal year 1942	
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance		Total
Mississippi: Mississippi rehabilitation farms.....	285.19												
Nebraska: Republican Valley farmsteads.....	7,154.19	1					\$150.00		\$16.00		\$16.00		
New Mexico: El Pueblo grazing project.....	79,268.27						86.42	\$1,165.00		\$6.88	1,171.88		
New Mexico scattered farms.....	4,636.60	1					103.00						
Silver City farms.....	21,548.85	4											
Oklahoma: Tulsa County homesteads.....	15,023.52	1											
South Dakota: Spearfish.....	32,233.51	2						\$32,000.00					
Tennessee: Goodlettsville farms.....	15,360.00							11,100.00					
Texas: Mexia colony.....	71,033.41												
Nacogdoches farms.....	80,938.32	1							346.00		346.00		
McLennan farms (Waco).....	244,845.74	20			(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	5,263.21	147.71	939.87	526.95	2,845.42	
Virginia: Colonial acres.....	4,555.14											41.98	
Wisconsin: Langlade and Oneida project.....	21,944.03												
West Bend farms.....	7,060.11	2				4,000.00		4,262.00					
Wisconsin scattered farms.....	9,412.58	5											
Vulcan Corporation.....	600.00												
Total.....	1,148,611.64	74				47,100.00		32,413.85	10,132.33	5,222.52	533.83	15,888.68	6,445.91

PROJECTS TRANSFERRED TO FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

Alabama: Bankhead farms.....	\$1,046,420.80	100	\$722,052.80	\$7,220.53	100	\$194,370.00	\$1,943.70	\$342.02					
Cahaba.....	2,760,610.47	287	1,807,709.13	6,298.64				68,446.67	\$33,453.86		\$46.59	\$33,500.45	\$16,123.83
Greenwood homesteads.....	827,835.37	83	537,019.12	6,470.11	83	162,291.00	1,955.31	3,493.59					
Mount Olive homesteads.....	618,162.84	75	504,038.52	6,720.51	75	151,187.00	2,015.83	2,862.77					
Palmerdale homesteads.....	938,865.08	102	664,988.11	6,519.49	102	100,681.00	1,868.44	3,818.68					
Tuskegee homesteads.....	18,590.00												
Arizona: Arizona part-time farms.....	564,013.05	91	332,691.38	3,655.95				7,825.09	9,586.87	3,060.98	1,547.10	14,294.95	
Phoenix homesteads.....	104,869.28	25	92,184.70	3,687.39	25	89,150.00	3,566.00	99.50					
California: El Monte homesteads.....	292,476.81	100	260,868.91	2,608.69	100	299,400.00	299,400.00	3,459.98					
San Fernando Homesteads.....	102,065.23	40	88,725.13	2,218.13	40	105,960.00	2,649.00	1,232.92					
Colorado: Denver homesteads.....	120,095.94	3						4,725.11	351.00	700.00		1,051.00	4.00
Illinois: Lake County homesteads.....	554,745.92	53	545,456.07	10,291.62	47	186,467.00	3,967.38	11,926.77	2,097.86	1,696.38	1,648.27	6,342.51	1,585.46
Indiana: Decatur homesteads.....	157,279.94	48	146,955.48	3,061.57	48	156,140.00	3,252.91	4,240.99				1,357.68	4,783.17
Iowa: Dracner homesteads.....	216,189.87	50	206,175.77	4,123.52				9,756.80	1,357.68			302,744.76	33,256.67
Maryland: Greenbelt.....	13,701,817.17	890	8,819,732.66	9,909.81				550,661.46	204,219.83	98,515.22	9.71	302,744.76	33,256.67
Michigan: Ironwood homesteads.....	1,373,138.48	132	1,056,762.87	8,005.78				25,810.09	8,603.00		6,673.86	15,276.86	5,018.11
Minnesota: Austin acres.....	213,227.87	44	185,359.33	4,212.71	44	63,796.00	1,449.91	1,686.96					1,112.70
Duluth homesteads.....	983,984.30	84	865,552.56	10,304.20	84	225,742.00	2,687.40	7,755.84					2,136.92
Mississippi: Hattiesburg homesteads.....	75,648.78	24	60,518.18	2,521.59	24	49,720.00	2,071.67	94.20					1,317.65
Magnolia gardens.....	73,556.46	25	71,286.85	2,851.47	25	60,000.00	2,400.00						1,400.99
McComb homesteads.....	91,452.52	20	77,962.27	3,898.11	18	21,910.00	1,217.22	1,592.24	698.00	306.00	773.84	1,777.84	1,394.00
Tupelo homesteads.....	139,247.12	35	121,446.93	3,469.91	(²)	(²)	(²)	431.48		341.13		341.13	
Tupelo suburban gardens.....	29,047.32												
New Jersey: Jersey homesteads.....	3,402,382.27	206	2,165,372.63	10,511.52				39,384.37	10,943.28	12,370.10	661.58	23,974.96	6,674.19
New York: Monroe County homesteads.....	43,020.53	2						440.00					
Ohio: Greenhills.....	11,860,627.53	737	8,012,917.17	10,872.34				314,553.50	182,799.03	52,461.29		235,260.32	32,630.27
Mahoning Gardens Home.....	46,277.71												
Pennsylvania: Westmoreland homesteads.....	2,510,469.81	255	1,117,737.08	4,383.28				31,528.54	20,440.20	8,142.10		28,582.30	10,848.28
South Carolina: Greenville homesteads.....	20,382.78												
La France homesteads.....	6,509.71												
Saluda garden homesteads.....	21,351.01												
Tennessee: Cumberland homesteads.....	3,267,345.10	202	1,989,543.36	7,593.68	209	431,263.72	2,063.46	17,876.90	8,436.23	11,438.30	15.10	19,889.63	12,901.08
Texas: Beauxart gardens.....	143,027.62	50	119,250.96	2,385.02	50	125,000.00	2,500.00	3,450.01					
Dalworthington gardens.....	325,712.35	79	237,743.00	3,009.42	79	150,000.00	1,898.74	4,171.80					
Houston gardens.....	283,668.10	100	221,793.65	2,217.94	100	275,586.00	2,755.86	7,549.60					
Three Rivers gardens.....	162,943.43	50	118,824.32	2,376.49	50	82,650.00	1,653.00						
Wichita gardens.....	187,527.85	62	170,208.54	2,745.30	62	131,716.00	2,124.45	3,850.38					
Virginia: Aberdeen gardens.....	1,353,896.29	159	1,008,232.30	6,341.08	2	4,411.22	2,205.61	25,727.81	9,120.29	3,537.00	4,903.90	17,561.19	5,424.24
Washington: Longview homesteads.....	104,097.58	60	181,533.23	3,025.55	60	174,900.00	2,915.00	4,704.72					
West Virginia: Arthurdale.....	2,744,724.09	165	1,439,459.21	8,724.00				\$ 27,260.00	27,743.89	4,695.54		32,439.43	10,869.14
Red House.....	1,506,397.82	150	629,996.43	4,199.98				\$ 26,485.00	6,756.13	1,706.09	4.07	8,466.29	9,906.50
Tygart Valley homesteads.....	2,060,213.99	195	759,385.01	3,894.28				\$ 33,950.00	12,016.13	1,999.23	11,500.88	25,925.24	13,228.62
Wisconsin: Greendale.....	10,638,465.62	640	6,601,376.44	10,314.65				301,478.95	168,273.81	108,945.00		277,218.81	32,545.60
Total.....	65,808,271.69	5,483	41,940,864.09	7,649.25	1,427	3,332,240.94	2,335.13	1,552,664.74	707,897.09	309,914.36	28,193.90	1,046,005.35	205,077.09

¹ National Youth Administration project.

² Transferred to Interior Department.

³ Record of receipts transferred to Federal Public Housing Authority. These amounts are estimates.

FOOD PRODUCTION—THE CANNING
INDUSTRY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement on the subject of the canning industry.

The production of food is one of the most important programs with which this Nation is now concerned. Great projects lie before us, and in all these projects the role which food will play will be of the utmost importance. We must feed and sustain our own armed forces; we must fulfill our lease-lend commitments to our allies; we must provide full and ample food for our civilian population; and, moreover, we must supply needed foodstuffs—when they are liberated—to all those people who now suffer at the brutal hands of their German and Japanese conquerors. These are worthy and prodigious tasks, Mr. President; such tasks as will require the most capable management, the most exhaustive development, and the most effective coordination of all our food-production resources, if the goals which we have set for ourselves are to be attained.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the results which have marked our efforts thus far leave much to be desired. There is scarcely one segment of the food-production industry which is making its most complete and effective contribution to our food-production program. For this condition neither the industries nor the managers and workers in those industries are at fault. The farmer, the producer, the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer are all doing everything within their power to see to it that each and every one of these food-production goals is met.

But the fact remains that the agencies created by the Government to coordinate, support, and assist in this great food-production program have failed in many ways to perform the tasks which have been entrusted to them. The result has brought confusion, doubt, and delay into every field of food production; and it has, moreover, brought decreased production in many important food lines, decreases which, if continued for any length of time, will certainly pose grave problems for America and her allies.

Mr. President, I have talked with many of those who are directly concerned with our food-production program, and they are one in denouncing the overlapping authority of the various agencies concerned, the multiple jurisdiction of agencies which now seek to operate this program, the lack of cooperation between these various agencies, the impossibility of getting a clear-cut decision on any point of issue, and the wealth of confusion, inefficiency, and red tape which surrounds the efforts of those governmental agencies which are concerned with the food-production program. This is such a condition as will lead inevitably to the collapse of our entire war economy, as well as our traditional system of free enterprise, if it is allowed to persist unremedied.

Mr. President, only this week I had occasion to meet with the Pennsylvania representatives of the American canning industry. For more than 9 months, these

representatives and this industry have been contacting the various Federal agencies concerned with the food-production program, hoping to achieve something in the way of a clear statement of the Government's policy, the regulations that would be in force, and other similar statements which every businessman must have if he is to run his organization effectively during wartime. Now I will not recount here all the frustration, confusion, doubt, disagreement, and mismanagement which the operators of this industry found among, and received from, these various agencies here in Washington. Suffice it to say that after the passing of 9 long months, and with the harvesting season right at hand, the canners in America still do not know where they stand, nor do they know what they are to be permitted or expected to do by these various Government agencies.

Mr. President, Mr. Summers and Mr. Warehime, two of the representatives of the canning industry in Pennsylvania, have written me in some detail describing a seven-point program which they and their associates in the canning industry feel should be adopted, if the food-production program is to go forward uninhibited, and if the food-production goals which we have set for ourselves are to be attained. Because I feel that the recommendations outlined in their letter are sound and workable, because I believe that their recommendations might well be applied to every aspect of our food-production effort, and because I feel that they might well be called to the attention of those who are in any way concerned with the all-important food-production program, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FREEDOM, PA., June 7, 1943.

SENATOR JAMES J. DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: The food industry and the canning industry, in particular, are in what we might describe as a rather desperate position due to the confusion, lack of direction, lack of authority, and the impractical methods applied by various war agencies to the industry. While authority is not particularly lacking, yet it overlaps in many agencies so that one agency cannot decide a relatively simple question until they have the assent of possibly two or more other agencies. If only one of the latter happens to disagree, then the entire question is unanswered. Frankly, we are at our wits' end as to how to proceed. We have been contacting, among others, the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, and the Food Distribution Administration (formerly Department of Agriculture) since early last November. We have been annoyed and plagued with innumerable vague promises and cannot brook further delay, as the harvests are now ready. We intend to start harvesting peas this week.

Food processors individually and collectively have attempted to bring some order out of the chaotic conditions in Washington by applying to and recommending to the various agencies in question. Please remember that this is over a 9-month period, and we still have no answers to the major portion of our problems. The National Canners' Asso-

ciation, through its legislative committee, has presented a great bulk of testimony, some of which was solicited by these agencies and some which was volunteered by the association. The legislative committee has appeared before the House Agriculture Committee, the Smith committee of the Senate, as well as numerous agencies, all without results. The industry has, therefore, made out a program of seven points which we believe would be a great help in solving some of these vexing questions.

Point No. 1. Employment of personnel who are practical and not inexperienced theorists.

There are definitely men available in the canning and allied industries and also other walks of life who can definitely do a good job for various Government agencies, mainly for Office of Price Administration, who are willing to come to Washington to do a job for the Government for the canning industry, but at the present time under the set-up would not come due to interference and also other powers who would block their recommendations. This has been the case in the past years as the Office of Price Administration had two experienced and very practical men, namely, Mr. Daniel Gerber and Mr. Norman Sorensen. Conditions were so bad in Office of Price Administration that they were forced to resign as their recommendations were never taken and their policy makers would not take their advice in conferences or in any other phase of the policies of Office of Price Administration.

Point No. 2. Nineteen hundred and forty-two formula prices were enacted for all canned foods, and in most cases did not work a hardship on the canners, and the formula was flexible enough for this type of canner to work without losing money or to change his style of pack; also, it did not interfere with production. Again we wish to refer you to the testimony of Mr. Sorensen before the Smith agricultural committee that not more than 300 hardship cases came before Office of Price Administration, and also if these experienced men's recommendations would have been followed these hardship cases could have been disposed of in very short order.

The Office of Price Administration decided early last fall to compel dollars-and-cents regional ceilings on the canners. Various delegations from the canning industry pleaded with Office of Price Administration not to enforce these regulations, and testified before them the unworkable conditions on their dollars-and-cents ceilings. As an example, with a low-grade packer with no personnel and very little overhead, it would be necessary under the dollars-and-cents ceilings for the packers who are producing the most cases per plant and who have the organization and equipment to do the job which the Government needs, to pack at a loss under the dollars-and-cents ceilings which have been announced for peas, beans, tomatoes, and corn.

The formula prices have worked last year and Dr. Galbraith admitted at a Senate hearing (Dr. Galbraith recently resigned from Office of Price Administration) that to the best of his knowledge no canner profited on this basis of the formula system of Office of Price Administration last year.

The fact that dollars and cents ceilings are unworkable for all canners in the area, also that formula price has worked in 1942 and also the fact that other commodities such as lima beans, asparagus, tomato products, and numerous others will have a formula price for 1943, why not have all canned foods under the formula price? It would be well to point out that everything Office of Price Administration has done since last fall has been against production and quoting from Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican from New Jersey, at a hearing last Thursday, he stated "From a business point of view the canners would have been

justified in doing little or nothing to pack this year's crops of vegetables. It is only their patriotism which assures our armed forces and the country of adequate canned foods this year."

Point No. 3. Although grade labeling, that is, the grade being put on the label, has been discarded by Office of Price Administration, the regulation still works such a hardship on the industry that it is still almost impossible to speed production by the mandatory method of putting grades on invoices.

The canning industry has built up good-will reputation on their use of brands or commercial grades. The most popular items on the grocers' shelves are being bought by consumers by the brand or commercial-grade method. It has proved to be the most practical for consumers' good will, quality, and production. If this is recognized as true in peacetime, then with all the extra work and the problems of distribution which confront us during wartime, it is not necessary to change and establish policies at this time for the most production. In case of any disputes, the industry has always settled arguments by the arbitrary system which included a panel of three men, one representing the buyer, one the seller, and a disinterested party.

Point No. 4. Meetings were held with the Office of Price Administration officials in regard to increased costs for 1943 and the price ceilings as announced for 1943 were in some cases lower than those the canners had for 1942. The canners proved by cost sheets their increased costs for 1943. The Office of Price Administration up to the present writing has not recognized any increased costs which the canners proved to them that they would have; also the Office of Price Administration would not divulge where they got their costs for 1942. The main increased costs are labor and overhead, as plants which used to pack on a 12-month basis are now cut back to 4 months, due to the shortage of tin. Canners are not objecting to 50 percent of their production being cut, as they realize tin is not available, but organizations have to be kept together and paid which puts a higher overhead cost on the summer months pack of fresh fruits and vegetables. As stated in a preceding paragraph, Dr. Galbraith submitted in testifying to the Senate hearing that in 1942 there were no canners who profited through the Office of Price Administration set-up, and since price ceilings in 1943 are less than or not more than 1942, and with the increased costs which canners will have, there will definitely be a loss for some packers on some products and some packing operations for this coming season. In addition, canners in each State were forced to certify and pay growers minimum prices. The Commodity Credit Corporation paid back to each canner so he in turn could distribute to his growers this increased cost and in the case of Pennsylvania, this was not done for beans and tomatoes. The canner will have to lose this increased cost because the Office of Price Administration has not recognized the increase to growers in their price ceilings.

Point No. 4 is that the increased cost of the 1943 packs shall be reflected in the ceiling prices. Early this year after meetings with our local War Board of the Department of Agriculture, we and other canners, following their recommendations contracted fruits and vegetables with our farmer-growers at the prices recommended. We received assurance by the Department of Agriculture that the ceilings as issued by Office of Price Administration would include subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation to equal the advances paid to farmers. In this manner inflation would be checked and the ceiling prices would be set at relatively the same levels as March 1942. However, in setting the ceiling prices the Office of Price Administration has used higher produce costs than last

year which does not return the processor the recommended advances to the farmer. As an example, in southern Pennsylvania we paid \$19 per ton for tomatoes last year. The War Board recommended \$27 a ton. Subsequently we contracted at this figure. However, in computing the ceiling price the Office of Price Administration figured the cost at \$23 a ton—\$4 above the price of last year. The Commodity Credit Corporation took the position that since Office of Price Administration had figured on this basis that the subsidy would only amount to \$4 per ton rather than the \$8 differential between 1942 and 1943. The Office of Price Administration attempted to justify this with the statement with the effect that regardless of the raw produce price used by them, the difference would be reflected between our cost and their ceiling price. This statement is undoubtedly true provided their ceiling price reflected this difference in cost. However it does not. Our 1942 cost based on \$19 gives us a cost which is almost identical with the Office of Price Administration's ceiling price which was figured at \$23. In other words, the processor is penalized \$4 a ton. This is not an individual case but is the average case. The processor is in no position to absorb this difference. Recent meetings with Office of Price Administration and Food and Drug Administration and Commodity Credit Corporation have resulted in these agencies all admitting that the above is correct. They also advise that they expect to issue an amendment to MPR 306 correcting this situation. However, this amendment will again only include part of this \$4 in question. In other words, as a compromise they expect to give us \$3 instead of \$4. In this particular situation Pennsylvania is harder hit than any other of the 25 or more States packing tomatoes, although the condition is equally true to a great extent on other products in other States.

The above refers only to raw produce. No provision has been made for the increased costs in overhead, labor, or supplies. Due to the restriction on tin, our 1943 production will be cut approximately 40 percent. We have no complaint with this limitation order on tin plate. Due to the shortage of this commodity, it is only right and just that it should be limited. However, a 40-percent cut in production results in a higher overhead cost per unit. The Office of Price Administration will not even consider this question. In regard to wages, the canning industry wants its wages raised. The freeze order of September 1942 froze our wages at a low level and those of war industries at a high level. Subsequently, agricultural labor has been permitted sufficient increases, but this has not been extended to processing labor. As it stands now, we cannot secure the labor at the wages permitted, which leaves us two alternatives: One to proceed with our pack and openly violate the wage freeze; the other is to let the crops rot in the fields. Certainly, very few processors intend to follow the latter course. However, if we take the former course we will be in very serious legal difficulties. Numerous applications for relief by both individuals and communities have been made through the War Labor Board. Only a very few of these have been acted upon. Originally, the Office of Price Administration made public promises that if the War Labor Board authorized wage increases then the Office of Price Administration would permit these wage increases to be added to the ceiling costs. During the last 6 weeks the Office of Price Administration has reversed themselves on this policy. Apparently all of the petitions to the War Labor Board are now tabled due to the so-called policy makers in Office of Price Administration, the "hold the line" order, or the coal strike. In one case it has come to our attention: A Utah canner was authorized to increase wages by the War Labor Board but at the same time

was not permitted to include these increases in his ceiling price. He has instructed his growers that he cannot handle the pea crop, and therefore has notified them to harvest the pea crop as hay for cattle. In another case a pay increase was authorized by the War Labor Board and Mr. Byrnes for asparagus cutters in California. Here again the Office of Price Administration has not provided for this increase to be added to the ceiling costs, with the result that the asparagus packers on the west coast have now been packing for 60 days, paying the wages authorized, and yet they cannot sell their pack until the Office of Price Administration provides them with a ceiling price. There is none at present. Valuable time is being lost, and warehouses are being congested, and the food is not available to consumers until the Office of Price Administration makes this decision.

Point No. 5: The industry is opposed to subsidies on principle, but if they are employed with price control, the said subsidies, together with a ceiling price, should cover the cost of processing plus a reasonable profit. In every case it should be made clear that the processor acts only as an agent for the ultimate beneficiary and is never the recipient of any subsidy.

We, as processors, do not approve of subsidies in principle and we wish there was some other method to be found. However, it appears that this is about the only method available. As noted above, these subsidies do not return the differential requested by the war boards of the Department of Agriculture. In the case of these subsidies we are simply the agents of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture and we would like the public to thoroughly understand that the subsidies referred to are turned over in full to the grower. This has not been made clear and in many cases employees have understood that the entire industry was subsidized.

Point No. 6: The transfer of complete control over manpower and wages of processing employees to the War Food Administration where the responsibility for production now rests.

While Mr. Chester Davis has control over production, yet many of his decisions are hindered and delayed due to the fact that he has to refer his decisions to the War Labor Board on labor and Office of Price Administration on price ceilings. More frequently than not, no decision is forthcoming because one of the three agencies disagree on principle. It would be a great deal more satisfactory if one agency could handle all problems in relation to food production. At the same time Mr. Davis would probably be just as helpless as Mr. Prentiss Brown if he were hamstrung and obstructed like Mr. Brown, with orders coming down from above. As we see it, it is not absolutely necessary to transfer all of these functions to one agency provided there could be some relief from the impractical personalities involved and the impractical theories under which Mr. Brown is now forced to work.

Point No. 7: In all cases the experience of the industry should be consulted in advance of promulgation of every regulation as required by law.

The law provides that industries shall be consulted. This has not been the practice in the past. In a number of instances the industry has been called together supposedly for consultation only to be advised that the regulation had already been made and the industry was, at the time, presented with the results of the agency policy makers. The vast experience which the industry could offer was entirely ignored and the industry is required to work under complex regulations evolved by lawyers and professional economists. In a number of instances, practical men who were in the employment of Office of Price Administration or other agencies made certain specific recommendations. In all

cases these recommendations were entirely ignored, with the result that these capable members of the industry resigned, since they felt that agencies had given proof that their experience and counsel were unwelcome. In this particular instance, we direct your attention to the testimony given by Mr. Norman Sorensen before the Smith committee. A copy of this testimony is attached.

We think it is fairly well agreed that the problem of food is probably second only to munitions so far as the war effort is concerned. It is frequently stated that food will win the war and write the peace. Due to floods, adverse weather conditions, and the conditions outlined above, it is undoubtedly true that the food production of the country during 1943 will be some 5 to 10 percent less than in 1942. The large crop in 1942 was primarily due to unusually good and favorable weather throughout the United States. The food industry has had a cycle of about 6 favorable years so far as weather is concerned, and from weather conditions to date it would appear as though the average were about to catch up with the industry. There is nothing much we can do now about 1943's food production as the crops are in the ground, except to alleviate immediately the squeezes created by the above-outlined conditions. Our best efforts should be directed at this time to food production in 1944 and it is none too early to begin this program.

We leave to you the methods of bringing about compliance and cooperation of the various agencies involved. Possibly this can be brought about through parliamentary procedure or possibly through a tightening of the purse strings. Certainly one of these methods is the only method which promises prompt relief. We do not feel that Congress should necessarily concern itself with the thousands of details. We believe the best method will be to put a competent man in charge, but at the same time see that he has complete and full authority. Any attempt at legislation either for 1943 or 1944 would, we are sure, result in months of unprofitable discussion. No fully comprehensive bill could ever be written on such a complex industry. We trust that you will do anything in your power to alleviate this extremely serious situation which threatens not only the domestic economy but to a large extent our military efforts and that of our allies, who have been made grandiose promises through lend-lease.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES G. SUMMERS, JR., INC.,
STRAN SUMMERS,
HANOVER CANNING CO.,
M. WAREHIME.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the conditions outlined and the recommendations made in this letter speak for themselves. The recommendations are worthy of every study and consideration—and something very closely resembling such recommendations must immediately be made effective, if the food production program in America is to go forward successfully. The experience encountered by the canning industry is not unique, it has been repeated many times over—by the meat packing industry, by the farming industry, by the dairy industry, and by almost every other major food-producing industry in the Nation.

Mr. President, we must bring order out of this chaos. The divided, overlapping, and incomplete authority now designed to regulate this particular program is vested in no less than seven distinct Federal agencies. And among these agencies, cooperation and harmony has not been the order of the day.

Indeed, a quite converse situation is in existence. In the meantime the food-production capacity and the food-producing industries of America are made to suffer because of this unbearable and inefficient administrative set-up.

Mr. President, I submit that immediate action must be taken to effectively remedy these conditions, unless we are prepared to see America lose the battle of food production, and possibly the battle for self-preservation as well.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate with a prolonged discussion of the subject which has been under debate during today, but I do not wish to permit this opportunity to pass without expressing my unqualified approval of the Farm Security Administration program in the State of Montana.

I believe all Senators are aware of the conditions which prevailed throughout the West as a result of the depression and the drought which passed over the country during the thirties. As a result of those conditions in my State and other similarly affected areas it was absolutely necessary for some rehabilitation program to be established and carried through to aid the hard-pressed farmers. The program of the Farm Security Administration as carried out in my State has been most effective, and it has accomplished results there which will have a lasting benefit.

I have in my hand a letter written by a former administrator of the Farm Security Administration in Montana, but not now connected with the Administration in any manner, in which he discusses the program in my State and points out the broad benefits which it accomplished. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in my State the draft has revealed the fact that sons of farmers of Montana were able to meet qualifications for service in a very high percentage. This, in my judgment, was a result of the aid which was given to our farmers during the distressing period of the depression and the drought. It salvaged many a Montana farm family. I myself have passed over those sections of the State which were severely hit during that period when widespread bankruptcy and ruin faced our citizens. I can say here now that the Farm Security Administration in Montana has accomplished results of

enduring benefit, and it would be a great misfortune to my State and to the Nation if the Farm Security program were not continued.

EXHIBIT 1

BOZEMAN, MONT.,
May 5, 1943.

Mr. JAMES G. PATTON,
National President, Farmers' Union,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. PATTON: Since I have severed my relationship with the Farm Security Administration, I feel at liberty to state my views concerning the work of this organization.

In the first place the philosophy back of the organization is sound and should have the support of all people who are interested in maintaining democracy in this country. Due to the various programs inaugurated by the Farm Security Administration this country was better prepared to meet the situation relative to food production than it would have been otherwise. The fact that farm people have been taught to produce and preserve foods for home use, the work of this organization means much during the crisis through which we are passing.

There has existed for many years a "no-man's land" between the work done by the land-grant colleges and a large segment of our agricultural population. It is true that the Extension Service was founded with the idea of carrying the work of the land-grant colleges and experiment stations into the rural areas but it is also self-evident that the Extension Service has failed miserably in its assignment in that it has only touched a small percent of the people who actually need the assistance it was in a position to render.

The Farm Security Administration, on the other hand, has reached down to this lower level and given help in a financial, social, and technical way. There is proof on every side that these people to whom the Farm Security Administration has extended aid will react as favorably as any other group if they are given an opportunity to do so.

Many of our boys now serving in the armed forces were enabled to do so by reason of the fact that the Farm Security Administration, through its county supervisors and home supervisors, has encouraged and helped people to secure a satisfactory living insofar as necessary foods are concerned.

If you will pardon me I would like to call to your attention a case which I have in mind at this time. There was a large family in the Billings area who, through adverse conditions, came to the Farm Security Administration for aid. It was necessary to give these people assistance for a few years in the way of grants to supplement their loan. The children of this family were undernourished at the time the Farm Security Administration stepped into the picture, but with the assistance the Farm Security Administration gave them they were furnished the means to secure the food necessary to maintain health. As a result of this, one of the boys was enabled to pass a successful physical examination and entered the Air Corps. He was with General Doolittle over Tokyo and lived to come back and do his bit to stimulate the bond drive in Montana.

I recall another situation in Montana in which there were 19 boys called up for induction. Eighteen out of the nineteen passed their physical examination. Eighteen families out of the nineteen had also been assisted by the Farm Security Administration through grants and loans.

While to me as State Director of the program, the loaning part of the program was only one tool with which we had been provided to do a job, people need something besides money. This has been thoroughly demonstrated by the fact that many of them

had had credit before and still had not made a success. With the personnel trained in the philosophy of extending aid in the way of counsel and advice, the majority of these people who are considered poor risks by other lending agencies are demonstrating the fact that loans made on a character basis are just as sound, and oftentimes more so, than loans made on ample chattel security.

More important than the repayment of the loans is the fact that these people form a large segment of our social structure and unless given an opportunity to produce and have security they would become a greater threat to our country and its institutions than foes from the outside.

From my experience I doubt if there is any strong justification for any other governmental loaning agency for agriculture.

The Farm Security Administration's program is the most vital factor in the production and preservation of the essential food needed during the wartime. Its organization has long been geared to do the job in agriculture which was created by the attack upon Pearl Harbor. It is the only agricultural set-up that is geared to do the job in the war period provided sufficient funds and authorities were granted to it. Funds and authorities should be provided that would enable it to assist farmers in securing homes of their own or in enlarging un-economic units, also to purchase, develop, and distribute to tenant farmers large tracts of land now owned by absentee landlords. Funds and authorities should be provided to extend and aid in the development of farmer cooperatives for buying, selling, and processing.

Since the Extension Service has failed in carrying necessary educational work to those who most need it, the Farm Security Administration should be encouraged to enlarge its activities in this field.

It is true that the Farm Security Administration has made what some might be inclined to call mistakes. Whether they were mistakes or not time will tell. Since the Farm Security Administration has been a pioneer in new fields of human endeavor regarding the helping of those in a disadvantaged status economically, socially, and educationally, it might be a better term to call the various attempts at human rehabilitation as experiments. There have been many things that the Farm Security Administration has had to learn by trial and error, having no precedent to follow. Any financial loss that society may have or will incur through the funds spent by the Farm Security Administration is compensated a hundredfold by what has been done in the rebuilding of the morale of a large group of our agricultural population. Further than that, through the encouragement given by the Farm Security Administration many people have been stimulated to endeavor to raise their standard of living and to take an interest in giving to their children, who are the future citizens of this country, an opportunity in life.

We cannot estimate in dollars and cents what this means to society. It means that we have removed many boys and girls from the list of potential criminals or wards upon society.

In closing may I urge you, as representatives of the common man, to use your utmost influence to secure for the Farm Security Administration sufficient funds and authorities to enable it to carry on its proper work and also to enlarge its scope of activities.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS HORSFORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I would have spoken upon the subject of Farm Security Administration anyway, but I have upon my desk thousands of letters from farmers, merchants, and business-

men from North Dakota asking me to do so.

I have before me an advertisement in the Columbus Reporter entitled "We the Merchants and Businessmen of Lignite and Columbus Respectfully Urge Congress To Provide for:"

And it mentions the F. S. A. among other things.

I have another advertisement from the Watford Association of Farmers, made up of merchants and businessmen in the city of Watford City, N. Dak.

I have another advertisement which was inserted in the Flaxton Times by the merchants of Flaxton, N. Dak.

I have here a front-page article in the Powers Lake Herald of May 21, 1943.

I have here a petition which appeared as an advertisement in the Bowbells Tribune by the merchants of Bowbells, N. Dak.

I also have a half-page advertisement which appeared in the County Record on May 20, 1943, which was paid for, the advertisement said, by the Hettinger Civic Association, made up of hundreds of businessmen.

I have here a full-page advertisement which appears in the Mott Pioneer Press, stating that the advertisement is sponsored and paid for by the following businessmen of Mott, N. Dak. They are the same 50 businessmen, the names of whom I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wick's Hotel, Mott Drug Store, Log Cabin, Defoe Mortuary, White City Mercantile, Gamble Store, Sax Motor Co., Wolf Den, Mott Pioneer Press, R. A. Grant, S. S. Reishus, O. H. Opland, Anonymous, Chas. Senn, Wm. Rueter, Standard Oil Co., Mott Shoe Hospital, C. J. Hardmeyer, Ferguson-Olien Shop, O. K. Rubber Welders, Busy Bee Service, Mott Dry Cleaners, N. L. Sauer, Pete Senn, Mrs. N. A. Mosher, J. C. Roster, E. H. Yonaka, Frank Biglor, Alexander Roll, Margules Store, J. C. Penney Co., J. B. Murphy, Fietsam Hardware, Mott Supply Co., Red Owl Store, Occident Elevator, Equity Elevator, Mott Mill & Elevator Co., Kramer's Service Station, Thompson Yards, Inc., Mott Blacksmith Shop, Peter Boehm, Grosz Meat Market, Olien's Repair Shop, Mott Implement, Wangsvicks', Schafer's Market, Johnson Standard Service, Mott Hide & Fur Co., Mees Implement, Weiler Plumbing & Heating, Mott Creamery, Commercial Bank of Mott, Mott Equity Exchange.

Mr. LANGER. I have a full-page advertisement appearing in the Bowman County Pioneer, signed by approximately 50 businessmen, whose names I also wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. This advertisement was published on the 27th of May 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L. L. Molde, Martin Beckwell, Roy J. Messmer, F. U. Co-Op Store, J. C. Stuber, Stone & Puckett, Bowman Co. Pioneer, H. V. Burmeister, James Quinn, C. T. Olson, Bowman

Drug Co., Omer Sheets, Andy's Bar, Stanley Benson, H. E. Myer, A. N. Gausemel, H. G. Hinkley, H. F. Olson, Gus Schade, John Schade, H. H. Dahl, J. M. Ryan, C. H. Peterson, H. N. Fisher, Fritz Schade, H. J. Bagley, F. G. Beyer, Bruno Klug, Otto Schade, Joe DeBode, Bennett Drug, Lawrence Septon, Bert Patterson, Lyle Stebbins, Wokal Auto Co.

Mr. LANGER. I have also a full page advertisement which was inserted by the Watford City Association of Commerce, and the McKinzie County Farmers' Union, which was published on May 20.

I have another one which was published in the Bowbells Tribune on May 27, 1943, and signed by the Burke County Farmers' Union, Glendon Bryan, president, and Milford L. Sernsen, secretary-treasurer.

I also have here numerous other advertisements with which I will not clutter the RECORD, inserted by businessmen, professional men, and farmers of the State of North Dakota. So today I speak at their behest.

Mr. President, although I am a North Dakota Republican, ever since I have come to the Senate I have voted with the President of the United States, a Democrat, whenever I felt that the President was right. Whenever I felt he was wrong, I voted against him.

I hold in my hand a letter written by the President of the United States on May 29, 1943, addressed to Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union. The letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 29, 1943.

JAMES G. PATTON, Esq.,
President, National Farmers' Union,
Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MR. PATTON: I have your letter of April 8 urging my continued support of the Farm Security Administration. My position on this matter has not changed since my letter of July 2, 1942, written in response to the joint appeal sent me by yourself and leaders of other prominent organizations interested in this agency's continuance.

The necessity for achieving maximum effort from all our farm producers is even more evident today than it was then. The small farmers of the Nation aided by the Farm Security Administration have given an excellent account of their ability and their patriotic determination during the past year. I am sure that with continued assistance they will equal or surpass that record this year.

I am opposed to any step that might impair the work that the Farm Security Administration has been doing among these small farm families.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, it seems to me very odd—and I am not impugning the motives of any Senator in this body—that when big business industrial enterprise is concerned we do not hear any criticism, no matter how much money is squandered, but when the small farmers are concerned, a few defenseless, small farmers, then upon this floor for months past we have heard about the greedy farmers. Only a few months ago we heard how they were impeding the war effort, and upon this floor we heard criticism of Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Goss, Mr. Patton, and of John Brandt, and all the other great

farm leaders of this country; indeed, there were advertisements in some of the newspapers of the East saying that the farmers of the country were so greedy or were so anxious to get rich that they were deliberately impeding the war effort. Upon that occasion I myself rose on the floor to defend the farm leaders.

But, Mr. President, what do we find during the last 2 days? We find the distinguished Senator from the State of North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] delivering a speech impugning the motives of labor. I have that speech before me. The Senator from North Carolina says that he is anxious to assist the President of the United States in holding the line against inflation even though the farmer's price may go up a little bit. He says the workers are going to demand more and there will be a spiral of inflation.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators upon this floor away for a few moments from the farmers and from John L. Lewis and the miners, and I call their attention to what I consider to be one of the dirtiest and most contemptible steals that have ever taken place in the United States of America. I refer to the major oil companies and to the large oil interests. We have not heard one word of criticism of them, although in a speech delivered months ago by Representative COFFEE, of the State of Washington, a record was made that showed that the Attorney General of the United States entered into a consent decree by which the large oil interests took from the people of this country anywhere between \$1,500,000,000 and \$3,000,000,000. I hold in my hand that speech, and I have verified the letters which appear in it.

I find, for example, a letter to Mr. Thurman Arnold calling his attention to the fact that suits have been brought against three of the major oil companies and asking that it be not settled until Congress could be consulted. Here I have the answer of Mr. Arnold. There is a second letter dated the 22d day of October 1941, signed by the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, from which I will read a few lines:

It is the intention of Assistant Attorney General Arnold to submit any plan which may be suggested for the settlement of this litigation to the proper congressional committee for its consideration before the Department officially accepts the plan.

Mr. President, what happened? At that time only three major oil companies had been sued, but on the 23d day of December 1941, some 15 or 16 months ago, the Attorney General's office at 10 o'clock in the morning sued 18 more oil companies, and, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, they signed a consent decree. The Government sued on the same day the consent decree was signed; indeed, even the judge—Judge Pine, of the Federal district court—was so shocked that when the consent decree was taken he was heard to remark, "Ah, the Christmas spirit, I perceive."

Mr. President, up to the present time, aside from a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], not one voice upon the Senate floor has been raised in protest against

this taking of \$1,500,000,000 out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country; but when a small appropriation reaches the Senate, which is designed for the benefit of the small farmers in 47 of the 48 States of the Union, we have long, extended debate.

Mr. President, I wish to go further in connection with the oil situation. I desire to show something that happened last November and was covered up.

Mr. President, back in the Taft administration, those who guided the destinies of our Navy were sufficiently farsighted to realize that the secret of victory on the high seas was oil. I come right back, Mr. President, to oil, and I again remind the Senate that on the 23d day of December 1941, there was signed a consent decree which deprived the people of this country of \$1,500,000,000, although the question as to whether the Government had an air-tight case was ably answered by an article in the Cornell Law Quarterly, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 8, 1940, and entitled "Oil—Pipeline Divorcement by Litigation and Legislation" written by Dr. Forrest R. Black, professor of law, attached to the Department of Justice, who spent well over a year in studying the law applicable to the case. He revealed in the article that the Department of Justice believed it had a copper-riveted case. Although the Department believed it had a copper-riveted case, it sued 18 major oil companies on the 23d of December at 10 o'clock in the morning and settled all the lawsuits by 2 o'clock in the afternoon. So we come back to oil to find out who is in charge of this Government, whether the Government is being operated in behalf of the poor people, in behalf of the taxpayer, or in behalf of a bunch of scoundrels and crooks who are robbing the people of this country. If so, we come back to oil once more.

I repeat that back in the Taft administration those who guided the destinies of our Navy were sufficiently farsighted to realize that the secret of victory on the high seas was oil. So, Mr. President, they set aside for the United States Navy some of the finest oil reserves in the entire United States. It was provided that those reserves were to be kept in the ground where bombs could not destroy them, where the oil tanks could not be set afire, and the reserves were to be used at a time when the oil of the rest of the world was running low.

The history of those oil reserves since is well known to us. They have been the object of the covetous hands of the big oil companies. There has been wire pulling; there has been lobbying; there have been little black satchels; there has been a total of \$330,000 paid in bribes by Harry Sinclair and Edward Doheny to get those priceless oil preserves of Teapot Dome, Wyo., and Elk Hills, Calif., into the hands of private interests. So far, however, our Government has resisted private greed; that is, it resisted it until a few months ago; but now I regret to read that this administration has practically given away to the Standard Oil Co. of California the second richest oil preserve in the

world, namely, Elk Hills, known as Naval Oil Reserve No. 1. This reserve has been given to a company which, it is true, has owned a small part of the Elk Hills oil field, a shallow area largely overrun with salt water and containing a very doubtful amount of oil; but because the Standard Oil Co. of California has owned a small corner of the Elk Hills oil field, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, for reasons best known to himself, has permitted 43,000 acres of the richest oil lands in the United States, second in richness only to one field in Arabia, to be taken over in toto and developed during the next 5 years by the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Furthermore, it may be significant that this oil lease—or a better term might be "oil give-away"—has been given to the company which has placed its high officials in key spots inside the Roosevelt administration. They are Ralph Davies, former vice president of Standard Oil of California, who is now Deputy Petroleum Administrator and has charge of most of the Nation's petroleum activities for war under Secretary Ickes. It seems to me significant that Mr. Davies has been drawing a salary of \$56,000 from Standard of California and at the same time drawing \$8,000 from the Government. He is not a dollar-a-year man; he accepts a Government salary. But also, during all of last year, he continued to draw a salary from the company which has now received this bonanza oil lease from the Roosevelt administration.

Then, working with Mr. Davies, is another important member of Standard Oil of California, Mr. Howard Marshall, its attorney. Mr. Marshall was formerly an attorney for the Office of the Petroleum Administration, in the old N. R. A. days, and prepared an important legal case against Standard Oil of California. Just before that case was to go to trial, he left the Government to join the legal staff of Standard. And now he is back in the Government again, weaving in and out of private industry and Government offices like a shuttlecock, and working with Mr. Davies for the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Another Standard of California official in Washington is Mr. Mark Thornburg, oil adviser to the State Department. Still another interesting figure, who left Washington last week, is Mr. Ed Pauley, who has just resigned as secretary of the Democratic National Committee, but remains its treasurer. Mr. Pauley has been very close to Standard Oil of California in the past. He himself is an oil operator, and some time ago sold out his interest to a subsidiary of Standard of California. He is on intimate terms with Mr. Ralph Davies, and also, of course, he is on intimate terms with the President of the United States.

Now let us examine more carefully what this deal between the Navy and Standard Oil of California involves, by which our priceless oil reserves are given away for a song. This contract between Standard and the Navy was signed on November 18, 1942, by the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox. It was a very

hush-hush deal. These oil lands had created more comment, more debate, more discussion, than any others in the world. They were responsible for the resignation of two members of the Harding Cabinet, Albert B. Fall and Edwin Denby. Yet the Navy Department, very quietly, without letting anyone know about it, without even discussing the matter with other members of the Roosevelt Cabinet, signed this contract, rushed it to the White House, and somehow or other got it approved by the President in a single day. Why the President acted in 1 day, only he knows. Other officials have known memoranda and contracts to remain on his desk for weeks. But here was a deal in which the entire Nation was interested, and the subject of which had been the source of great controversy in the past, and which many of our distinguished colleagues had spent weeks and months in protecting.

Yet, after the President signed on November 18, and without waiting for any congressional approval or any congressional appropriation, Standard Oil of California rushed its drills and derricks on to Elk Hills and began drilling for oil. They began on November 20, and already have drilled eight excellent wells.

Meanwhile, the Secretary of the Interior, in charge of Public Lands, who is also the Petroleum Administrator, was not informed regarding this vital contract. Nor was the Justice Department, whose Lands Division is supposed to negotiate contracts regarding public lands, informed of this give-away of the Navy's vital oil resources. The only indication which leaked out at the time was a threadbare and very deceptive statement issued by the Navy on December 11, which stated that—

The Secretary of the Navy has entered into an agreement for acquisition of lands owned by Standard Oil of California in Naval Oil Reserve No. 1 and for operation of the field by Standard.

It will be noted that this Navy announcement states that the Navy has acquired lands owned by Standard Oil of California. Remember that word, in view of the real terms of the contract. The Navy's meager statement goes on to say:

This oil reserve has been enlarged to include all of Elk Hills. By the terms of the agreement the Standard Oil Co. will convey to the Government its 8,330 acres of land. The Navy will compensate Standard for its interest, for the wells and property on the reservation, in the ratio of their respective interests.

The whole tenor of this brief naval announcement gives the impression that the Navy has acquired something, rather than has given it away. However, the press was given no opportunity to review the terms of the contract, nor was the Congress, nor was the Cabinet. Particularly, it is significant that the man who has fought for conservation of oil in the past, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, was not permitted to know anything about the deal.

But, by accident, the Interior Department and the Justice Department heard about the deal, and secured a copy of the

contract. And when they did so they were horrified. For they found, instead of the United States Government acquiring lands, actually the Navy had given away for a period of 5 years all of its carefully preserved oil lands in Elk Hills. And, after the 5 years, two-thirds of the oil goes to Standard Oil of California, while only one-third is returned to the Navy Department. And yet, out of the 43,000 acres, Standard owns only 8,000 acres, or less than one-fourth. In other words, Standard contributes one-fourth of the oil lands—most of them overrun with salt water—and in return for that one-fourth it receives two-thirds of the oil—after the first 5 years. But during that first 5 years, Standard receives all the oil and the Navy receives none.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.
Mr. MILLIKIN. Who pays the cost of development?

Mr. LANGER. There was supposed to be a \$2,000,000 appropriation for that purpose, but the Standard Oil Co. did not wait for that money. The Standard Oil Co. rushed in and drilled wells within 2 days after the contract was signed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Standard Oil Co. of California participate in the cost of that development program?

Mr. LANGER. The Standard Oil Co. pays for it in its entirety, but that land is all proven land. It is not a wildcat proposition at all; it is all proven territory. It is the outstanding oil field in the world, next to one in Arabia.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to bring to the Senator's attention the fact that that field was laid up to serve the Navy in time of war, and, without knowing any of the facts, it may be that the Navy thought this was the time to release the oil for the war effort.

Mr. LANGER. Then why the secrecy?
Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know. There may have been a military reason for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Joseph Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the last war, wrote a letter to Senator La Follette, Sr., some years ago, in which he said:

I remember one night toward the end of a session that Mr. Roosevelt [then Assistant Secretary of the Navy] and I remained at the Capitol all night long, watching the legislation of closing hours fearing that some act might be passed that would turn over these invaluable oil reserves to parties who laid claim to them without even decent shadow of title.

Secretary Daniels was referring to the last war.

But now the shoe is on the other foot and it is the Congress of the United States, not the Navy, which is attempting to preserve the oil reserves of the fleet.

We all remember the day when the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil scandals first were brought to light. There was no accusation of graft against the then Secretary of the Navy, Edwin Denby. It was only a charge that he was weak-

kneed. He had bowed to Albert B. Fall. He had permitted the transfer of these oil lands to the Interior Department. And, because of that, Denby resigned.

Since then the oil reserves were transferred from the Interior Department back to the Navy for safekeeping. And now the Nation is faced with another weak-kneed Secretary of the Navy, a Secretary who, without informing the public, signed away this coveted wealth of oil.

Let me review briefly some of the actions of this same Secretary of the Navy and some of the men he has placed in positions of trust around him. I think we all agree that a man is known by the company he keeps and that a high official of the Government is known by the men he chooses for positions of trust near him.

One of the most important speeches ever made by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, was on March 4, 1933, when, with the banks of the Nation closed, he promised to "drive the money changers out of the temple." That speech thrilled the Nation, and Mr. Roosevelt in the immediate months that followed proceeded to carry out his pledge and did drive the money changers out of the temple.

But now I call your attention to the manner in which the money changers have come back into the temple. Furthermore, they have come back into the temple of our fighting forces, the first line of our national defense, the Navy. Examine the men whom Frank Knox has placed in the key positions in the Navy Department. First, there is the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James Forrestal, former president of Dillon, Read, a banker. Next there is Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Artemus L. Gates, of the New York Trust Co., another banker. Next there is Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Ralph Bard, president of the Chicago Investors Corporation, another banker.

Now I would like to ask what a banker knows about fighting. What does he know about running the Navy? A man who directs the Navy must know what it means to take chances. He must have courage, nerve, daring, intestinal fortitude of the highest quality. But what does a banker know about taking chances? What does a banker know about initiative, technical development, farsightedness, planning?

A banker is trained not to take chances. He is trained to hold back, never to push forward. He is trained to avoid taking risks. His job is to protect his investors, protect his stockholders. The last thing in his line is to cruise out and meet the enemy. He hides behind barred windows, shelters; he is trained to squeeze, to scale down interest, to shave every penny.

What, I ask, is there about the banking business which can contribute to the operation of a great Navy? What is there in the record of Mr. Artemus Gates, as a member of the Greenwich Savings Bank, or the American Surety Co., or the Mercantile Insurance Co., or the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. which would help him to operate the greatest Navy in the world?

And what is there in the record and experience of Mr. James Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, as a banker which would qualify him to direct our admirals in the greatest war in history? Is it because he negotiated a loan to Bolivia which precipitated the famous Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay? Is that what makes him the good executive to direct a naval war and to give away our oil reserves?

Four weeks ago, when President Penaranda of Bolivia was visiting Washington, the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, actually had to apologize for the loans which the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, had forced upon Bolivia. Mr. Roosevelt in press conference stated publicly:

I told the President of Bolivia that I wanted to apologize for the loans we had forced his country to take. Those bonds were sold at such high prices, at a time when nobody in Bolivia wanted the loan anyway, that Bolivia was forced to default. If I have anything to do with it—

Continued the President of the United States—

there will be no more bond selling of that kind in Latin America.

The only company which had sold bonds to Bolivia was Dillon Read, of which James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, was president. Furthermore, the circumstances under which those bonds were sold were extremely unfortunate. The famous Vickers Arms Co., of England, had sold Bolivia a quantity of arms and ammunition with which Bolivia was building up its army to make war against its neighbor Paraguay. Vickers was unable to collect from Bolivia, so what did Dillon Read under Mr. James Forrestal do? It stepped in and put up the money of American widows, American school teachers, and American orphans, and loaned not merely \$5,000,000 but \$28,000,000 to Bolivia. There were even rumors at the time that the Bolivian Minister of Finance got a cut out of the deal.

Yet, this man, for whom the President of the United States apologized, who forced these war loans on Bolivia, is now sitting at the right hand of Secretary of the Navy Knox, helping to give away our oil lands.

But here is the prize gentleman who directs the destinies of our great Navy, at the right hand of Secretary Knox. He is Joseph W. Powell, who has a very interesting record. In the last war, Mr. Powell was vice president of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., and, as such, built ships for the United States Government under circumstances which have been the subject of very important litigation by the Justice Department. The Justice Department has sued the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., and the case went up to the Supreme Court of the United States, which handed down a scathing opinion. Although in that opinion the Court found for the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., it did so only because the United States Government had delayed 20 years before bringing suit. However, the most interesting part of the opinion is the Supreme Court's remarks about the special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Joseph Powell.

According to Associate Justice Frankfurter and the district court's findings, Mr. Powell was guilty of daylight robbery. The district court, according to Associate Justice Frankfurter, found that Powell "adopted the famous Rob Roy distinction—he admitted he was a robber, but proudly proclaimed that he was no thief."

Associate Justice Frankfurter pointed out that Charles Piez, vice president and general manager of the United States Fleet Corporation, had had no previous shipbuilding experience, and that—

Relations between Powell and Piez were very close. Piez, as Powell knew, had had no shipbuilding experience whatsoever, had implicit confidence in Powell's integrity and shipbuilding ability and experience, and was accustomed to look to him for information and assistance with respect to matters of shipbuilding.

United States shipping authorities attempted to "persuade Powell to undertake the construction upon a lump-sum basis," according to Justice Frankfurter. Powell was adamant, however, and insisted on a contract which cost the Government excess profits of \$26,759,479. Or, as Justice Frankfurter summarizes it—

The estimated costs were almost 29 percent greater than the actual costs. Nowhere in the long record, as the master found, is there any explanation or justification for the tremendous disparity between the estimated costs submitted by Bethlehem, those specified in the contracts, and the actual cost. Bethlehem's profits under these contracts amount to approximately \$24,000,000. * * * Bethlehem took absolutely no risk of loss. In addition, the Government agreed to advance all sums necessary to finance the construction of the vessels. Even in usurious transactions the lender takes the risk of the borrower's insolvency. Here Bethlehem took no risk at all.

That is the kind of a deal which Joseph Powell, the right-hand man of Secretary Knox, put across on the Government in the last war. Yet, despite that fact, he was given a place of confidence, a place of trust, as the personal adviser to the Secretary of the Navy in this war.

Furthermore, Secretary Knox had had occasion to know something about Joseph Powell much more recently. During a recent congressional investigation it was revealed that Mr. Powell had rented an apartment at the Shoreham Hotel and had paid for the expenses of Mr. Anning Prall, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. At the time, that news caused considerable publicity and much unfavorable criticism. Mr. Powell then was a lobbyist in Washington; and he was charged with using his friend, Mr. Anning Prall, Chairman of the F. C. C., to aid his private business connections.

Yet, despite all those known facts about Mr. Powell, the Secretary of the Navy gave him a position of vital confidence. It is no wonder, when a man has been instrumental in taking \$24,000,000 out of the pockets of the Government in 1917 and 1918, and is trusted by the Secretary of the Navy, that the Secretary of the Navy looks with indifference or even approval on the robbing of our national oil reserves by the Standard Oil Co. of California at this time.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators who are opposed to the Farm Security Administration to another kind of deal. Only a few days ago the Senate voted in favor of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Under the reciprocal trade agreement in effect with Mexico at the present time we have made an agreement to import from Mexico 700,000 head of cattle at 3 cents a pound. Not satisfied with the millions we have given her under lend-lease, Mexico put an export duty of 1½ cents a pound on those cattle. By that subterfuge we are financing the Mexican Government to the extent of 1½ cents on each pound of cattle so imported. The Mexican peon gets the other 1½ cents a pound for raising the cattle. Our American farmers are asked to raise cattle in competition with cattle selling for 3 cents a pound.

Again, Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia had to say about socialism and communism. It happened that on about the same day when President Roosevelt took office, I took office as Governor of the State of North Dakota. The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia says that what transpired in the establishment of the Farm Security Administration and kindred organizations was socialism or communism; to quote him exactly, he said it was following Russian communism.

Mr. President, I believe that when the history of this war is written, and when the historians come to detail to the people of the future the tragic conditions of the farmers of this country in 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, the verdict will be that President Roosevelt avoided a revolution in this country. I remember well when, in October 1933, former Senator Herring called a conference of Governors of 11 farm States. At that time we went to Des Moines, Iowa. Outside the territory of North Dakota, into Minnesota, into Nebraska, into Kansas, and into Iowa, wherever one went, the farmers were on strike. They were tipping over automobiles containing cream cans. In the State of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], we found that the first night we were in Lincoln, a man was killed a few miles south of the town. Governor Bryan, who had a brother-in-law down there, sent for him because, he said, revolution was breaking out in the State of Nebraska.

In the great State of Iowa—I note that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is present, and he will bear me out—in October 1933 the farmers burned or dynamited every bridge leading into Sioux Falls, Iowa. At the Governors' conference, five Governors, of whom I was one, were selected to come to Washington.

I well remember that when we walked into the Office of the President of the United States, there was Leo Crowley. He had in his hand six telegrams from six different cities in the State of Wisconsin. Three of the telegrams told how creameries had been blown up or burned down. In three other cases the farmers had put coal oil into the churns and vats to wreck the creameries. That was all brought to the attention of the

President. It was then, and only then, when the President saw the desperate situation which was facing the farmers of the country, with rye selling at 7 cents a bushel, wheat at 24 cents a bushel, corn at 13 to 15 cents a bushel, and eggs at 3 to 4 cents a dozen, that the President took the action which I shall describe in a few moments.

What was the situation in my own State? I have in my hand a report, not made to me when I was Governor, but made to my successor in office, Governor Moses, after I left the Governor's office, after we had had one good crop.

In Rolette County there were 997 farmers. Fifty-seven were self-supporting; 138 were partly self-supporting; 241 were dependent; 246 were renters; and 315 farmers had no roof over their heads. They were squatting, going from one place to another, trying to find somewhere to live.

It was at that time that the Farm Security Administration came along and gave those poor people \$346,000. The administration gave it to them because they needed it.

Take the Indian reservations. It has been stated on this floor that other agencies will lend money to those poor people. I was the Governor of North Dakota. We have Indian reservations in my State. Many of those Indians have farmed for years. They are men of good reputation and character. Does anyone suppose that those Indians could get a single bank to make them a loan? The banks would not make loans at the Standing Rock Reservation near the home of my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota. They would not lend a dollar. They would not lend a dollar to the Indians on the Elbow Woods Reservation. So I telephoned to John Collier and told him the desperate situation, and John Collier sent \$12,000 by telegraph. A few days later we needed more money, and again he sent it by telegraph. Time and time again John Collier sent money there to keep those Indians from starving to death.

Finally, after much persuasion, we induced the Farm Security Administration to make 12 loans, 6 to the Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation, and 6 to the Indians at Elbow Woods.

What does the record show? It shows that those Indians paid back their loans better than the average white man did; and yet today if we take away the Farm Security Administration, I do not know of a single place where those thousands of Indians will be able to go to obtain a loan. The same thing is true of the renters in various parts of the State of North Dakota.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina had to say 2 or 3 days ago. That brings me to the subject of prostitution. I now quote from Federal Probation, a quarterly journal of correctional philosophy and practice, published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina where the prostitutes around camps are

coming from. I have before me an article by Helen Hironimus, warden of the Federal Reformatory for Women, at Alderson, W. Va. What does she say? Let me read:

SURVEY OF 100 MAY ACT VIOLATORS COMMITTED TO THE FEDERAL REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN

(By Helen Hironimus, warden, Federal Reformatory for Women, Alderson, W. Va.)

The word "prostitute" brings to mind the picture of a person somewhat different from anyone included in this survey. The popular conception is that of a flashily dressed, gay, and reckless young woman with a certain amount of sophistication.

Recent articles lead one to believe that a prostitute from a camp area might be a homesick, bewildered young girl who left her home in a distant State expecting to marry her soldier sweetheart but found him departed from camp and herself stranded.

We expected to receive both these types of young women as violators of the May Act,¹ but instead there are very few who answer either description. When the United States marshals began depositing the undernourished, dejected, and bedraggled young girls and women on our doorstep we realized that we were in error. With only six exceptions, they have come from submarginal, industrial, and agricultural areas. Under ordinary circumstances most of them would have spent their lives in poverty and obscurity, but the world upheaval has changed their destinies. They were ill-equipped for the rapid whirl of soldiers, easy money, beer taverns, and freedom from drudgery, drabness, and monotony. The six exceptions are young girls who followed sweethearts or husbands to camp and resorted to prostitution when their funds were exhausted.

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST 100 CASES

The cases included in this survey are those of the first 100 women committed to the Alderson institution for violation of the May Act. To date the statute has been invoked in two military areas surrounding Fort Bragg, N. C., and Camp Forrest, Tenn., and the cases were received from the Federal district courts in the eastern district of Tennessee and the eastern and middle districts of North Carolina.

Race: Included in the group are 68 white offenders, 20 Negroes, and 12 Croatian Indians. The latter are all residents of an Indian settlement in North Carolina.

Period of commitment: Seventy-three of the women were committed for periods of from 10 to 12 months; 21, to 6 months; and 6, to periods of 3 to 4 months.

Age: The women ranged in age from 15 to 65, but, as might be anticipated, younger women constituted the largest portion of the group. Only 10 were above the age of 35.

TABLE I.—Age distribution of 100 women violators of the May Act

Age:		
Under 18.....	12	
18 to 20.....	25	
21 to 25.....	31	
26 to 35.....	22	
36 to 45.....	6	
Over 45.....	4	
All cases.....	100	

TABLE II.—Educational attainment of 100 women violators of the May Act

Educational attainment:		
No school attendance.....	15	
Less than 6th grade.....	25	
6th grade.....	27	
8th grade.....	25	
Entered high school.....	7	
Completed high school.....	1	
All cases.....	100	

¹ United States Code, title 18, section 518a.

TABLE III.—Intelligence classification of 100 women violators of the May Act

Classification:		
Imbecile (I. Q. under 50).....	8	
Moron (I. Q. 50-69).....	57	
Borderline (I. Q. 70-79).....	11	
Dull normal (I. Q. 80-89).....	16	
Normal (I. Q. 90-110).....	8	

All cases¹..... 100

¹ Average I. Q. for all cases is 67.7 (moron).

Educational achievement and intelligence level: The educational attainment of the 100 May Act violators, as indicated in table II, is quite low. The low level of achievement is explained in part by the restricted educational facilities and the limited opportunities for academic instruction in the areas in which most of the women have lived. Also significant in this connection are the results of standardized intelligence tests administered to the group (see table III). The school achievement claimed was belied by the fact that many of the women who had indicated completion of the fifth grade were found to be completely illiterate. A variety of explanations was given by the women for their limited school achievement; lack of suitable clothing or funds for books, inability to progress, irregularity of attendance, need for assistance in the home were among the most frequent.

Family and environmental background: A review of the family and environmental backgrounds of the group provides conclusive evidence that few of the women are of the sophisticated urban type. Nearly all were reared in rural areas or in small towns, and only nine in cities. Although half of the group came from farm homes, all but six were those of sharecroppers or tenant farmers. The parents of but eight were skilled workers and only one parent had professional status.

While it is difficult to establish with certainty the economic level of the homes, the facts available indicate that 67 came from submarginal homes, 27 from marginal, 2 from fair, and 4 from good homes.

The social histories are replete with recitals of domestic difficulties in the parental background. Forty-three came from broken homes, and in many of these, as well as in the other cases, delinquency, alcoholism, neglect, and cruelty were common. Other homes, while not vicious, were inadequate because of physical disability of the parents, or the absence of constructive discipline. In many instances the mother is reported to have been sexually promiscuous, cohabiting with various men and rearing illegitimate children in the home.

Marital status: The unsettled character of the environment, the limited educational background, and the restricted mental capacities of the group have their reflection in the adjustments made by the women in their various communities.

Of the 53 women who had married, 31 were reported to have been separated or divorced. That several of the group were sexually promiscuous is evidenced by the fact that a total of 31 illegitimate children are listed in the case histories, while 2 other offenders are presently pregnant with paternity unknown.

Employment history: Work histories are extremely limited and of slight consequence. Six women had histories of employment in textile mills or in laundries, 3 had worked on farms, 18 as domestics. An additional 15 claimed experience as waitresses, but for the most part this represented employment in taverns, tourist camps, dance halls, and the like.

Arrest record: That some members of the group already were known to the police and the courts is not altogether surprising. The fingerprint reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other official records revealed that 64 of the offenders had been arrested previously. The majority of the prior

arrests were not for serious law violations, arrests for misdemeanors were predominant. Charges of assault, disorderly conduct, drunkenness, solicitation, prostitution, and vagrancy account for more than two-thirds of the total number of arrests reported for the group. The justifiable inference from these records is that the delinquent activities of the group have been restricted to relatively minor law violations and that the number of habitual or professional offenders was very small.

History of prostitution: While it was clear from the arrest records that several of the women were involved in delinquencies when quite young, it was found quite difficult to establish with any degree of accuracy the length of time that any individual had been involved in prostitution or the age at which prostitution had begun. Sexual promiscuity, in many instances, dated to adolescence apparently as a consequence of the low moral standards of the homes and limited parental discipline. In few cases there is evidence of a history of professional prostitution for a considerable period, but for the most part, participation in sex activities on a commercial basis had its beginnings with the construction of military camps in the areas of residence. From the case histories and from interviews one is convinced, moreover, that there are a large number of the women who cannot be classified as prostitutes, but who are occasionally sexually promiscuous and whose activities would have escaped the attention of law-enforcement agents had their companions not been soldiers.

Use of alcohol and drugs: Almost without exception, the women who became sexually promiscuous when over 30 condone their actions on the grounds that they drank excessively. This reason also is given by a number of younger women. Only 9 of the women claimed abstinence from the use of alcohol, 35 reported themselves moderate or occasional drinkers, and 56 indicated excessive drinking. Of the latter group, 23 reported extended histories of alcoholism. None of the May Act violators committed to date has been found to be addicted to the use of narcotics. The excessive use of alcohol may well be symptomatic of fundamental problems of a psychological nature.

Other factors undoubtedly contributed to these delinquencies. Again the inadequacies of the community environment cannot be overlooked, but the precipitating condition was undoubtedly the introduction to the areas of large numbers of men having limited resources for amusement and relatively large amounts of money to spend. As one young girl expressed it, "There was more money and more men than we had ever seen, and we lost our heads."

Methods of operation: Further evidence of the fact that the activities of the violators were more or less spontaneous results of the impact of the war situation upon their individual lives is gained from the investigation of the character of the relationships. There is little indication that the activities were organized. The usual well-developed pattern of procurers, "madams," and brothels is nowhere in evidence. Only 24 of the women operated in houses. As a rule these women were members of small groups which lived together but solicited independently of each other. Five operated in hotels, two in tourist cabins, and one in a trailer. The remainder resorted to chance acquaintances and pickups and utilized cars, taxis, empty buildings, rented rooms, barns, and fields.

Earnings from prostitution: The earnings of the women varied and fluctuated from time to time. The Indian women denied the acceptance of money in any instance, explaining that this would be a sin. Ordinarily, when the soldiers had considerable money

they were generous and a fee as high as \$5 might be obtained. Sixty-eight of the women reported accepting whatever could be secured, never more than \$5, occasionally nothing; seven reported fees from \$3 to \$5; four from \$1 to \$3; four, \$1 or less; and five, lodging, food, and drink only.

THE TREATMENT PROGRAM

Further elaboration upon the statistical material would not appear to be indicated. The "typical" picture presented by the violators thus far received is that of a young woman in her early twenties, undernourished, with scanty, cheap, untidy clothing, the product of an insecure and unstable rural existence. Ordinarily, she is rather inarticulate and bewildered at finding herself in unfamiliar surroundings far from home, confined for doing something which she considered her own personal affair. What the picture might be if the provisions of the May Act were extended to other camp areas is, of course, problematical. Undoubtedly, if its provisions were put into effect in urban areas, a more heterogeneous group presenting wider individual differences would be committed. Our present sample, from this point of view, is probably quite typical but its homogeneity unquestionably reduces the number of treatment problems presented.

The relatively short periods of commitment and the fact that the offense constitutes a misdemeanor are the limiting factors in the development of treatment programs at the institution. It is difficult for the staff to formulate plans which will meet all of the needs of the various individuals in view of the short time available for treatment. Moreover, since the women are not legally eligible for parole or conditional release, they are denied the opportunity of receiving constructive supervision upon return to the community.

This is not to say, however, that nothing can be done for this group of offenders during their stay at Alderson. On the contrary, they receive many benefits. When these women were admitted to the institution, medical examinations revealed a wide variety of physical needs. Forty were in need of antiluetic treatment, and 4 required attention for gonorrhea. The relatively low rate of venereal disease may be further indication of the limited sex experience of some of the girls. Generally speaking, all were undernourished, and in only 24 cases had any of the offenders previously received dental attention. Of the remaining group, 37 were urgently in need of extensive dental treatment. Three serious eye conditions were noted, 7 tonsillectomies recommended, and 47 refractions for glasses. Four women suffered from pelvic defects and surgical treatment was indicated.

That other, though somewhat less tangible, benefits were derived, was apparent from the initial period of quarantine to the final process of release. It was a new world of sanitation, clinics, activities, and opportunity for them, and it was interesting to see their development. Marked changes in attitude were evidenced; and the personal appearances of the inmates were greatly improved with the increased knowledge of personal hygiene. So extensive were the changes that in many instances it became difficult to recognize the women. They appeared more youthful and self-assured.

Despite the difficulties in release planning, every effort has been made to prepare the offenders for their return to the community. For the women who will return to textile industrial centers, instruction in the use of power machines in the garment shop has been provided. Others have received training in the institution dining rooms and kitchens so that they will be able to accept

positions as domestics, waitresses, and cooks in areas where critical shortages exist. Still others have received instruction in farming.

CONCLUSIONS

After release from the institution some will have other conflicts with the law, but it must be remembered that in addition to their own personal deficiencies some of the women must face almost insurmountable difficulties. There has been an inadequate period of treatment and training and there is no supervision after return to the community. If some fail, others will succeed, and all of them have benefited to some extent by the opportunities offered to them. Although the sentences are of short duration it is better that they were committed here than retained in jails. Sanitation and personal hygiene have been substituted for disease, filth, and vermin; and constructive training has taken the place of idleness.

We know exactly where the prostitutes are coming from. I have before me testimony given before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which subcommittee the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] was chairman. This is the statement of Donald E. Montgomery, consumers' counsel of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers. This is his sworn testimony. He says:

Here they are in a few dashes of brutal statistics just off the Government press:

A. Forty-six million Americans living on cash incomes in 1942 below the \$1,500 level.

B. Twenty-seven million of these living below the \$1,000 level, and spending, as a whole, more than they took in as cash income during 1942.

C. Over 11,000,000 families whose annual cash expenditure for food was, at best, about \$530 a year, or about 50 cents for each family meal, and was on the average only \$350 a year, or about 35 cents a meal for the family. Many of these 11,000,000 fared even worse.

The conscience coordinator would program the steps necessary to see that the elemental needs of these people are met. He would recommend, undoubtedly, that the food stamp plan or its equivalent be put back to work, not on a surplus basis but on a need basis. It need not subsidize voluntary idleness, but neither need it tolerate involuntary hunger. In addition to the unemployed and unemployable, it would have to help buy food for many families who are described as fully employed, including some whose breadwinner is on a Federal, State, or local pay roll, especially janitors, charwomen, clerks, and school teachers.

He should develop also plans for preferential rationing of the cheaper types of foods for these low income families. Under a shortage of food, people of means turn to the use of foods which usually are left to the meager tables of low-income families. Rationing gives the well-to-do a claim on their share of cheap foods, but of course takes no steps to bring expensive foods within the reach of low-income families. Preferential rations of the economy types of food for these families would give them some protection.

Mr. President, I shall not make any invidious comparisons. I have before me the record showing the profits made by the corporations of this country during 1941 and 1942. Take, for example, agricultural machinery, the very machinery which these men and women

must buy. The distinguished Senator from Virginia says that this program is collective farming, communism, and socialism. I have read the record, showing that some of those people have only 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 acres. Would the Senator have a man farming 10 or 20 acres, or even 80 or 160 acres, buy a great quantity of expensive farm machinery?

Is it not good sense on the part of the Government to organize a cooperative of 8, 10, or 15 farmers to enable them to get together and seed and harvest their crops? What do we find? We find that in 1941, and 1942, the profits of agricultural machinery manufacturers rose 211 percent.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table entitled "Appendix C," showing the percentage change in profits after taxes, 1939-41, arranged by industrial groups, for 1,716 large industrial corporations, and ask that that part of the article appearing on page 5 of the United Dairy Farmer for April 15, 1943, dealing with the Office of Price Administration studies of manufacturers and merchants, showing the profits for the first 3 months of 1942, also be inserted.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every group of manufacturers or merchants whose earnings are reported by the Office of Price Administration studies as increased at all above earnings for 1939, is a group taking undue profit out of the pocket of the middle- and lower-income groups of wage earners. To claim that the corporations' increased profits come from larger volume of business is no justification; because, if true, then logically, so long as the average worker's earnings have not been increased to a living wage, the profiting corporations should reduce their prices on account of their increased volume of business, so that their earnings would remain on the same level as those of the worker; i. e., to the 1939 level, when the war started.

Instead of this, what do we have? We have, by the quotation above and by further reference to volume No. 1, table I, the news that 156 corporations engaged in trade (wholesale, retail, etc.) increased their earnings from 1939 to 1941 by 72.9 percent. In dollars these 156 corporations took in the sum of \$493,730,000 in the single year 1941.

And we have 131 food corporations increasing their earnings in that same period by 62.4 percent, taking in \$361,908,000 in 1941. The increase in net profits alone of these two groups who deal with the very essentials of life for American workers was \$347,000,000 for 1941 above 1939 net profits.

Added to this are the further increases in rate of profit that these corporations have obtained since 1941. Quoting the Office of Price Administration again.

Volume No. 4, page 1: "Profits before income taxes in 1942 are continuing to rise substantially above the high levels of 1941."

* * * It is estimated, therefore, that 1942 profits of all manufacturing industries will show about a 40-percent rise over the 1941 level."

WAGES MUST RISE

Even if excess-profits taxes at last should catch up with this increased rate of earnings, it will be the ultimate consuming public who will be paying the corporation taxes. The corporations are not being asked to reduce their assets in any way to help pay for the war. So again the public, the man who works for a wage, must get a raise in his pay, and quickly.

Percentage change in profits after taxes, 1939-41, arrayed by industrial groups (1,716 large industrial corporations)

Industrial group	Number of companies	Percentage change 1939-41
Total of groups.....	1,716	55
Durable goods:		
Aircraft and parts.....	30	338
Lumber products.....	23	283
Railway equipment.....	26	255
Agricultural machinery.....	8	211
Shipbuilding.....	8	165
Iron and steel.....	84	146
Industrial machinery, nonelectrical.....	120	127
Miscellaneous machinery.....	28	126
Building machinery and equipment.....	31	97
Nonferrous metal products.....	27	96
Building construction.....	11	81
Miscellaneous metal products.....	49	81
Automobile parts and accessories.....	74	72
Business machinery.....	15	63
Copper mining and smelting.....	17	60
Electrical industrial machinery.....	31	58
Building materials and supplies.....	65	49
Household appliances.....	42	37
Automobiles.....	20	35
Furnishing, nonbusiness.....	16	29
Nonferrous mining and smelting, excluding copper.....	25	9
Nondurable goods:		
Paper and products.....	72	135
Textile fabrics.....	62	120
Meat packing.....	16	88
Rubber products.....	27	80
Sugar.....	23	74
Petroleum.....	79	65
Miscellaneous textiles.....	9	58
Textile apparel.....	38	47
Leather and shoes.....	24	44
Paints and varnishes.....	13	43
Miscellaneous.....	36	32
Printing and publishing.....	41	25
Alcoholic beverages.....	26	18
Industrial chemicals.....	35	18
Other chemicals.....	15	16
Miscellaneous food products.....	45	14
Nonalcoholic beverages.....	13	14
Drugs, soaps, and medicines.....	26	5
Dairy products.....	16	4
Containers, excluding paper.....	12	3
Tobacco products.....	22	7
Baking and grain processing.....	28	15
Trade:		
Wholesale trade.....	22	56
Retail foods.....	23	17
Miscellaneous retail.....	105	16
Mail order.....	6	7
Services:		
Transportation services.....	42	143
Amusements.....	22	47
Miscellaneous services.....	45	21

NOTE.—Coal-mining group omitted because of a deficit in 1939. In 1941, profits of this group increases 92.5 percent over 1940.

Compare these percentage changes in profits of corporations after taxes of up to 338 percent with the Little Steel wage formula of 15 percent "or labor."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this exhibit shows that no matter in what business people have been engaged, whether the manufacture of food, farm machinery, or textile goods, the profits have gone up. However, we still find 11,000,000 families trying to serve themselves a meal at a cost of 35 cents for the entire family.

Reverting again to the speech delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] I invite attention to the enormous profits which were made by the shipbuilders. It will be remembered that by a vote of every Member of the Senate except five, the Senate said that was all right. Only five of us voted against it. Referring to the figures put in the RECORD by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1943, at page 285. In the

House of Representatives Representative CULKIN said:

My attention has also been called to the fact that this same company, operating a number of ships through the Red Sea on voyages between October 1941 and June 1942, made profits amounting to some \$3,342,000. These were single trips, and the net book value of these boats whose earnings on single trips was in excess of \$3,000,000 was \$800,000. This procedure, to my mind, smells to heaven, and every phase of it should be ruthlessly investigated and exposed.

Then the distinguished Representative inserted in the RECORD a statement showing the names of the ships and the trips which were taken.

We also have a report from Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, showing how another corporation organized with a capital of \$500 ran it into a profit of nearly \$3,000,000.

Mr. President, there has not been any criticism of that on the floor of the Senate. There was not any criticism the other day. When the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said that we were giving back nearly eight or nine billion dollars under the so-called Ruml plan, there was no objection whatever. Some said it was not forgiveness. I shall not now argue that question. My vote showed what I thought about the entire transaction; but the fact nevertheless remains that this morning's newspaper carried an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in which he was quoted as saying that he did not know where the \$35,000,000,000 which we must raise in taxes by January 1 is to come from.

Mr. President, to return to the Farm Security Administration, to sum up, I said a few moments ago that the merchants in North Dakota in overwhelming numbers, the chambers of commerce in practically every large city in the State, and thousands of the very best farmers in North Dakota say the F. S. A. has been the salvation of the State of North Dakota. I have the petition and the letters with me, and will be glad to have any Senator examine them.

In 1932 in North Dakota we had no crop. In 1933 we had no crop; in 1934 we had no crop; in 1935 we had no crop; in 1936 we had no crop; we had a small crop in 1937, and a poor crop again in 1938. We had fine, honest-to-God farmers out there who seeded 640 acres and never threshed 1 bushel. They depended on the F. S. A. and other Government agencies to help them. They did not leave the farms. They stayed there. As the President said in his letter to Mr. Patton, which I have already placed in the RECORD, they increased the food yield tremendously. They are out there now depending on the Senate to maintain the F. S. A. and other kindred organizations in force.

I wish only that Senators who want to abolish the F. S. A. could see farms such as we have in the great Northwest, where year after year there was no crop, where grasshoppers, rust, drought, and hail took the crop away in its entirety, and yet the farmers with their wives and children stayed there and tried to eke out a living.

They had no one to depend upon but the President of the United States and the Congress to see that they did not starve. I wish Senators had been there at that time. If they had been there they would not now be asking that the F. S. A. be eliminated.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, notice has been served that a final vote upon the pending bill must be reached before we adjourn. With the progress we have made, the Senate is likely to be in session until quite late this evening. Would the Senator from Connecticut object to having a quorum call so that I may submit a request for a limitation upon debate in connection with the pending bill?

Mr. DANAHER. I will not object to such a request, Mr. President. I hope that I may obtain recognition for about 5 minutes. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that my purpose in rising is to explain briefly for the RECORD my reasons for being unwilling to sign the conference report on Senate bill 796.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no desire to object to the Senator presenting his statement.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it necessary to have a quorum call before a request may be made for limitation upon debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only time a quorum is required under the rules is when a request is made to fix the time for a final vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the further consideration of this bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment, and on the bill. I may say that I have discussed the proposal with both the acting majority leader and the minority leader. The agreement, if entered into, will, of course, allow a 30-minute continuous speech to any Senator on any amendment and the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees on Senate bill 796, commonly known as the Connally bill, I found myself after several days of deadlocked discussion at odds with my colleagues on what seemed to me to be fundamental changes in the bill as it had left the Senate and which at that time had my complete support.

I might modify the word "complete" in the sense that I was by no means in accord with what seemed to me to be the extremity of the criminal penalties which were provided in the section known as section 4 of the bill, and yet I recognized that, in order to achieve the main objec-

tive upon which the Senate was in substantial agreement, it was necessary that one yield his own individual views as to a particular section, in this case, section 4. We cannot have everything the way we want it.

However, Mr. President, when the bill reached the House of Representatives marked changes were made, and when the House amendments came before the conferees for consideration, it became perfectly obvious that the philosophy of the Senate bill would be completely thwarted if the House language were to prevail. Although every one of the conferees sought to reconcile his respective differences, and much helpful progress was made over a period of several days, I found myself unable to agree on the bill as finally agreed upon in conference, in that the character of the bill has been fundamentally altered from the form in which it passed the Senate. Under the Senate version the lack of a definition of the term "labor disturbance," for example, which might give rise to authority for the President to seize a plant producing any article which may be useful for the war effort, placed the first section on tenuous ground, at best, but protections were afforded to all parties under the language of section 6.

I might point out that section 6 of the Senate bill provided that the United States Conciliation Service might certify a labor dispute to the War Labor Board, and, moreover, that the War Labor Board, for its own part, might take jurisdiction of a labor dispute whenever the Board found that the labor dispute had become so serious that it might lead to substantial interference with the war effort. Moreover, Mr. President, we had implemented the functions of the Board by permitting it to issue subpoenas in order to bring the parties before it and to command the production of documents, and, although we limited the Board somewhat by requiring that its decisions must conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the decisions, though final, were subject to review by the courts as to questions of law.

Mr. President, a review of such decisions is an inherent right, it has seemed to many of us; it is one which the Senate had interpolated into the bill by way of amendment on the floor. We felt that if the National War Labor Board, which up to this time had been functioning under Executive order, were to be given statutory status, if its decisions were to be final, in the absence of review, we would, indeed, be ascribing to it a most serious grant of authority. So, Mr. President, the Senate was in overwhelming accord, let me say, that the decision of the Board was to be final, except insofar as it was subject to review on questions of law. The conferees have eliminated that provision from the bill. In my judgment, it is a serious error, and since it goes right to the heart of the matter, it is sufficient, indeed, to cause all other points of dispute to take on unusual emphasis.

In the event of a labor dispute and before a strike and before plant seizure,

at least, the jurisdiction which we conferred on the Board by section 6 could be invoked, and its decision was "subject to review by the court on questions of law." The action of the conferees in eliminating provision for review not only revives but gives fresh impetus to the natural fears of possible abuse of the authorization. For example, in a plant employing many thousands, a dozen men, in combination, might provoke such a "labor disturbance," a term which as yet lacks definition, as to purport to justify a seizure, and men of design might easily so act in key plants or in key positions in a war industry. When the President seized the North American Aviation plant in June 1941, Attorney General Jackson, now Mr. Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court, handed down an opinion authorizing the President's action. He wrote:

The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements—they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

What Mr. Jackson then said is entirely true now, with this difference, that he was writing of a labor movement in terms of organized labor, whereas there is no such reference in this bill, and the labor disturbance may emanate from groups who hold no membership whatever in organized labor.

Again, Mr. President, under section 4 (a) of the Senate version of the bill, after the Government had taken possession of a plant it became unlawful for any person to coerce, instigate, or induce another to strike. The conferees have amended that language to cause it to reach, in addition, persons who conspire with or encourage any person to strike, under serious criminal penalties. Obviously for citizens generally or third parties, to coerce, instigate, or induce a strike against a Government agency operating a seized plant is one thing; an agreement among men who are actual employees of such a plant is a very different thing, and places this section, it seems to me, on an untenable basis in the light of the general provisions of law contained in the National Labor Relations Act, which recognizes the right of labor to organize and, also, to strike.

Again, Mr. President, it should be emphasized that the conferees, by encompassing the War Labor Board with requirements for conformity to the National Labor Relations Act may produce endless confusion, particularly since by depriving parties of an opportunity to seek a review on questions of law, the War Labor Board is given statutory status in making binding official decisions. Hitherto the Board, acting under Executive order, has itself considered its decisions merely advisory. They will now be final, with the result that the War Labor Board is given an over-riding power actually to write every contract of employment from one end of the coun-

try to the other in all instances covered by this particular legislation.

Turning to the conference report, I might point out that the first section gives the act a new title. The second section deals with definitions.

The third deals with the basis upon which the President may seize a plant, and it provides that—

Whenever there be an interruption in the production of an article which may be useful in the war effort if the President finds and proclaims that that interruption is due to a strike or other labor disturbance and that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of the plant in the interest of the war effort—

He may seize it.

Mr. President, assume a state of facts in which terms and conditions of employment have become so obnoxious that men have calculated their situation and have decided to strike. Instead of finding remedy for the grievances which have led to the strike, section 4 of the conference version would freeze those conditions and preserve the status quo. No remedy whatever is provided once the Government seizes the plant other than under section 5 of the proposed act, and under section 5 a majority of the employees will be required to join in application to the National War Labor Board for a change of such conditions.

Curiously any order the Board enters up pursuant to that application shall upon approval by the President be complied with by the Government agency operating the plant, mine, or facility. There is not one word, in terms, about its binding either the employer or the employees; it binds merely the agency of the Government which is operating it.

I particularly stated that there was no obligation "in terms" binding upon the employees; but there are sanctions imposed by operation of the other sections of the act proposed. Under section 6, once the Government has seized a plant, anyone who conspires with one of his fellows to strike, or one who instigates or induces or encourages another to strike, becomes subject to a penalty of not more than \$5,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Under section 8 of the proposed act there is a provision which has been imported into the measure from the House language of such nature that while under the first subsection of section 8 notice is required to be given to the Secretary of Labor, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board that a labor dispute has arisen, under subsection 2 the employees and the employer must continue production for a period of 30 days; and if at the end of that 30 days an election be taken, as the act requires, by the National Labor Relations Board, which results in a strike vote, then there will obviously be an interruption of production in the plant, whereupon the remedy of the Government is to seize the plant.

Therefore, Mr. President, all those employees who felt themselves aggrieved, gave notice of the labor dispute, took their 30 days' waiting period, continued

in the plant uninterruptedly, and thereafter voted to strike, find that they have voted themselves into that state and condition whereby the Government seizes the plant and the men become liable to criminal prosecution if thereafter they strike. It is an unusual situation, to say the least.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely desire to be sure I understood the Senator correctly. He did not mean to say that the men would become liable to criminal prosecution except in a case where the plant was actually under the operation and possession of the Government?

Mr. DANAHER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is the only case in which the criminal penalties apply.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I misunderstood the Senator, and was afraid others would.

Mr. DANAHER. It is possible the Senator from New Mexico did misunderstand, it is possible I misstated the fact, as I am speaking extemporaneously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that he has exhausted his 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I have 15 minutes on the bill, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I will take my 15 minutes on the bill.

Let me clarify the point the Senator from New Mexico makes, because I am under no misapprehension about the effect of the provision, and I am sure we are both in accord on the point.

Mr. HATCH. I was sure the Senator was not under a misapprehension, but I was afraid his words would be misunderstood. I hope he will clarify them.

Mr. DANAHER. I will clarify them beyond peradventure, I hope. What I hope I will be understood as saying is that if the men decide and vote that they wish to strike, and actually go out on strike, there is nothing in the proposed act which will compel them to go back to work. But if the Government seizes the plant on the ground that there has been an interruption due to the strike, and under a Government agency, operations are resumed in the plant, then such employees will become liable to the criminal provisions should they later strike. Is not that a completely correct statement?

Mr. HATCH. I wanted to be sure it was understood the criminal provisions did not apply until the Government actually had taken possession of the plant.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct, the Senator from New Mexico and I are in accord.

One other section impels present comment. Section 9, also brought over from

the House, is a provision amending the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, to say that no labor organization shall make a contribution in connection with any election in which a Presidential or Vice Presidential elector or a Senator or Representative in Congress, and so on, is involved.

Curiously, no provision is made to operate against management groups; there is no provision which would forbid manufacturers' associations, if you please, from making political contributions. The amendment applies only against a labor organization.

Mr. President, having mentioned some of the collateral points, I wish to revert for a moment to section 7, which after all is one of the most important features of the bill.

I hope I have made it apparent to everyone that the emphasis, as the proposed act stands now, is in the direction of enforcing seizure of these plants by the United States. Every single proposed remedy, every single penalty, is in the direction of driving the Government to seizure of the plants. What we had hoped to accomplish under section 7 of the Senate language was to make available to the employees a mechanism through which they might procure conciliation or adjudication of their dispute, whatever it might be, and rectification of the terms and conditions of employment, if they required modification or amendment. It operated in favor, not of forcing seizure but of amelioration of conditions in a plant, and the Board was given power to act sua sponte, or on the application of the Conciliation Service.

Mr. President, the conference has stricken out those highly remedial, highly effective means of achieving a modification and correction of the difficulties which lead to a strike, and completely eliminated them with reference to any plant where the Government has actually made a seizure. In other words, if the plant is in operation producing war materials and there be a dispute of such nature that the Conciliation Service certifies it to the War Labor Board, jurisdiction may be had under section 7. Also, as an alternative, if the War Labor Board believes that the labor dispute is so serious that it would lead to interruption, the War Labor Board may take jurisdiction. But neither of those sections will apply if the Government actually has seized a plant, under the conference language. The result is that in any case where a Government seizure has been effectuated, the employees who were disgruntled in the first place, who were on strike because, let us assume, of obnoxious terms and conditions, now find themselves frozen in status quo, the cause of the dispute continues with no remedy whatever, unless a majority of the employees in the plant petition the War Labor Board for a rectification of conditions. Even then, whatever the decision of the War Labor Board shall be, it becomes final, because the men cannot strike without leaving themselves possibly answerable to the criminal penalties of section 6.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that under the bill even in the case of plants taken over by the Government whenever a majority of the employees desire to ask for different wages or different working conditions they have the right to apply to the War Labor Board?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator advocate that that should be done by a minority? The Senator seemed to make a great point of the fact that it took a majority to do it. I thought this was a majority country, and unless a majority of the employees asked for it, I do not see any reason why they should be given it. The Senator also must remember that under the criminal penalties for striking, under the Government operation, there is a specific clause which provides that no man shall be guilty of any offense under that section for quitting work, and doing no more. He is not guilty of anything then. But if he goes around and encourages or incites or conspires with other men, then he is guilty; is that right?

Mr. DANAHER. That is what it says. I do not say that it is right, but that is what it says.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the literary Senator's pardon. I should have said "correct", not "right."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will simply observe by way of reply to the Senator from Texas that in a war industry there may be 2,000 men employed, and only 24 machine-tool makers. The 24 machine-tool makers may be the very heart of that industry. Their grievance may be a very just one, a very complete one. They may even belong to a craft union which is in no way affiliated with a union which has the bargaining powers in a particular plant. It may in other words result, Mr. President, that a group of employees in a given plant will not be in position to secure redress from their Government of the conditions which were so obnoxious in the first place as to have forced the strike which led to the plant seizure.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the situation is so anomalous and so completely at variance with the genius of the Senate bill, that it is unfortunate, as I see it, that the matter has taken the turn to which I have adverted. I have simply stated my reasons for disagreeing action with reference to the conference report, to the end that my colleagues who are not here, and those others who may be interested may know how and why I feel as I do about the bill.

I may later speak in my own time when the conference report comes up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a time limitation now in effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me claim my own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it can be done in the Senator's own time, very well. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to proceed but that the time not be charged to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that if I surrendered the floor it might have been considered that I had spoken once.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, no; I will make an affidavit on that.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake at this time to reply to the Senator from Connecticut. I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut was a very useful member of the conference committee and aided the committee very vitally in perfecting the bill. It was with the deepest of gloom that the other conferees, both of the House and the Senate, viewed his failure to sign his name to the report. All five of the House conferees signed, and four of the Senate conferees, including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and myself. However, all the views which the Senator from Connecticut has expressed here were expressed quite eloquently and quite cogently and quite forcibly to all the conferees. Notwithstanding that, the conferees agreed to the report. When the report formally comes before the Senate I shall then seek the opportunity to make adequate reply to the points which the Senator from Connecticut has urged at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the very distinguished Senator from Texas yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will if I have the floor.

Mr. McNARY. When, in the opinion of the able Senator from Texas, will the conference report come before the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope it will come before the Senate tomorrow, because under the House rules the House cannot take it up except by unanimous consent until tomorrow. But I have consulted the parliamentary authority of the Senate, and he advises that if the House should act early in the day at least the Senate may then take the bill up because our rules do not require that the bill lie over.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, consideration of a conference report is always in order in the Senate even when there is a bill of any kind pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. But I had hoped that we probably would have until the first of the week further to study the report in the light of the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. We will see how that works out tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a further word. There are printed copies of the report, with the change of only one or two words, which do not change the meaning but simply change the text, which set forth the provisions of the bill, and I hope all Senators will consult copies of the report and read them before the report comes before the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I first wish to thank the Senator for his kind personal observations, and to assure him that I was not arguing this matter at this time, but simply out of candor and out of fairness and equity to my colleagues, I felt impelled to make a statement of the reasons why I found myself in disagreement with the Senator from Texas.

Let me add, Mr. President, that whenever I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Texas I want to make absolutely certain that I have good reason for my position.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut, with rare zeal and industry, both when he is right and when he is wrong, pursues very forcefully his objective, and I want to thank him for the many contributions he made to the effort to put the bill in proper shape. I only regret that he, like Brutus when he stood near the statue of Pompey, stabbed the report just as we were getting ready to start.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scringham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chandler	McKellar	Van Nuys
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to be as brief as possible in the discussion of this subject. First, I shall undertake to compare briefly the provisions of the substitute offered by the Senator from Virginia with the committee proposal. I must say in all deference that in listening to the remarks of the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, I was reminded of a current song hit, I've Heard That

Song Before. The Senator made a very able argument, but it was almost identical with the same argument he made on this proposition last year. I have before me the RECORD of May 18, 1942. I find that at that time the Senator inserted the statement which was made by one Paul Morris, as well as an editorial from the New Republic magazine. His recent discussion has been almost identical with the discussion had last year. I even understood the Senator to revert to some person named Sandy Garrett, of Childersburg, Ala. The RECORD of May 18, 1942, covers six pages of matter taken from photostats showing the horrible delinquency of Sandy Garrett, of route 1, Childersburg, Ala. The Senator from Virginia has again embalmed that individual in the records of the Congress and has shown his horrible dereliction. It turns out that it has been established beyond peradventure of doubt that Sandy borrowed \$1,107.55 and repaid only \$27.79. I did not hear the statement of the figures today. I do not know whether Sandy has done better or worse with his loan this year than he did with his loan last year; but I assume he is still delinquent. Of course, Mr. President, when farm loans are made to the poorest risks this Nation knows—people absolutely without any resources, without any means of establishing credit—we shall find that some individuals will not be able to repay their loans; and I doubt not that poor Sandy Garrett, of route 1, Childersburg, Ala., has a number of companions who have not paid the loans which have been made to them over the period of time during which the program has been in operation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was simply going to ask the Senator if there was not some evidence that in the flourishing twenties loans were made by the United States Government to a good many foreign nations, and I was going to ask whether in their repayments they did very much better than Sandy has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Sandy is in goodly company, the difference being that most of them did not have an opportunity to go down in history by having their cases charted in the Senate 2 years in succession.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. My time is limited, but I shall yield to the Senator.

Mr. BONE. No; under the circumstances I shall not ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The argument that loans were made for the payment of poll taxes was made last year. I am opposed to the bill for abolition of the poll tax; the Senator from Virginia also is opposed to it. Consequently, I do not see why he objects to the payment of poll taxes. Both of us have objected to the bill the purpose of which is to abolish by action of the Federal Government the payment of poll taxes. We have objected to the bill, not because we are opposed to having poll taxes abolished in our re-

spective States, but because we believe that the action to abolish them should be taken by the States themselves.

Reference was made to the fact that some of the persons who had borrowed money used some of the money to go to the motion pictures somewhere; and the witness, when grilled by the committee, broke down and confessed that it was wholly possible that, among the persons to whom millions of dollars had been loaned during the time the program was in operation, some of the borrowers had escaped the supervision of the Farm Security Administration supervisor, and had gone to motion-picture shows. Of course, the witness undertook to point out that any person who had borrowed funds from any other source was likely to have used some of the borrowed money in order to go to a motion-picture show.

So, Mr. President, it seems that the effort is being made to put these borrowers in a class unto themselves, when the entire objective of the whole Farm Security program is to bring them up into the class of all other American citizens, and to remove them from the segregation which they have endured by virtue of their poverty during all the years before this program sprang into being.

I shall not go into the merits of this question, other than to say to Senators from States which are largely populated by urban residents that they had better stop, look, and listen before voting to strike down the Farm Security Administration. That is what this amendment would do. Having failed to kill it outright, this is a proposal to kill it by slow strangulation over a period of 12 months.

Of all the sources of increased food production in the United States, the Farm Security Administration is paramount. The big farmers cannot greatly increase their production. The little farmer has labor available in himself, his wife, and his children. The only hope of increased food production is with the little farmer. I could fill the RECORD with statements from the hearings showing the extent to which this activity has been carried on throughout the Nation. The increase in food production among the 450,000 people dealing with the Farm Security Administration was 3 times greater than the national average. There is a simple reason for that. A man who has 20 acres in a farm-security loan can take care of a thousand chickens, 10 hogs, or 5 milk cows, and carry on all the work he has been doing, and still produce the food which is essential to the war effort, and for which there will be a greater demand as the months go by. The investment in this appropriation is but a small matter to consider when we reflect on the potentialities of the program.

The proposal of the Senator from Virginia, as he says, is made in an effort to consolidate. I would not be unkind enough to mention the fact that some Senators who have been most vociferous in their condemnation of the Appropriations Committee for legislating are now seizing upon this amendment as an opportunity to change the order from what it has been for the past 6 or 8 years, and to set up an entirely new system, dealing

with this question legislatively. We have a proposal to create an entirely new system. The amendment provides that the loans shall be made through the Farm Credit Administration, which is a quasi-Federal agency, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division, which is limited by statute as to the amount of loans. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina what the present limitation is. I have forgotten. What is the limitation on the individual borrower?

Mr. SMITH. Four hundred dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. The loans are to be made through the Farm Credit Administration and the Production Credit Association, which are wholly farmer-owned-and-controlled loaning agencies, and which require collateral of their borrowers. That is where this program is proposed to be placed. The supervision of it is to go to the Extension Service. No one has a higher respect than I have for the Extension Service, and no Senator has supported it more earnestly in the committee down through the years, when we were increasing its appropriations under the increment provided in the fundamental Bankhead-Jones Act. However, the Extension Service cannot and will not ever give the type of supervision which is required if we are to make a genuine effort to rehabilitate farmers.

Speaking of extravagance, it would be the height of extravagance to make an allowance of only \$4,000,000 for collecting and servicing nearly 500,000 loans outstanding, as well as lending \$40,000,000 additional. The loss to the Government would be far greater than a reasonable appropriation to supervise the rehabilitation of farmers and collect loans. The work is really in the nature of vocational education.

There is another very great difference between the proposal of the Senator from Virginia and the committee proposal. I refer to the question of grants. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia absolutely eliminates any grants to those in distress on the farms. It matters not how great a catastrophe may visit them. If through act of God a crop were absolutely destroyed in any way, under the proposal of the Senator from Virginia, there would be absolutely no agency of Government which could go into the afflicted area and afford any relief by way of grants to farmers who have seen their barns go down the river, or who have seen their crops parched from day to day beneath the blistering sun, or who have seen their fields ravaged by grasshoppers or insects.

The question of rural rehabilitation projects has been brought into this discussion. The Senator from Virginia this year, as last, discussed the horrible failure of the Arthurdale project and some other subsistence homestead projects. I am willing to concede that those projects were failures; but I say that whatever its faults may be, the failure cannot properly be charged to the Farm Security Administration. Every one of the subsistence homestead projects was in being when the Farm Security Administration was established in September 1937. Not

one of them is under the jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration today. Every one is in the National Housing Agency; and yet when we come to discuss the Farm Security Administration, these failure projects are brought up. I grant that they were failures. The failures are brought in and charged up to the Farm Security Administration, when they were all built by some other agency, and are now under the jurisdiction of a totally different agency.

The committee bill provides for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible, of the Rural Resettlement projects. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is silent on that question. It makes no provision for them. However, I understand he has an amendment which he said he intended to offer to another provision of the bill at a later date. The one which I understood him to read provided for the elimination within a fixed period. I say, Mr. President, that with the gigantic investment which the Government of the United States has in these projects, whether they are good or bad, it would be the poorest kind of business for us to require their liquidation within a period of from 12 to 18 months. We want them liquidated as rapidly as possible; but when they are forced on the market in a lump, who will buy them? It will be some man who has enough money to buy the whole thing at once, and who will make an inordinate profit out of the disposition of the lands he buys. It is much better to proceed with the liquidation in an orderly way, selling a bit here and a bit there, getting as much as we can, rather than legislating so as to increase the loss of the Government and prove that these projects were a complete failure.

Mr. President, I reiterate what I said last year, in view of the precedent before me. Only 8 out of 195 of these projects throughout the Nation were instituted by the Farm Security Administration. All the others were begun by other agencies of Government, under the subsistence homestead program, under the program of the Resettlement Administration, which was directed by Mr. Tugwell, or under the supervision of the Department of the Interior; and they were all dumped on the Farm Security Administration by Executive order. Only 8 out of 195 were really commenced by the Farm Security Administration; yet all the the sins of all the departments which have had to do with these projects during their long and tenuous lives are being charged up to the Farm Security Administration every time this appropriation item comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that when Senators criticize the Farm Security Administration for the omissions or sins of some other agency, they forget the many projects and the many rehabilitations which the Farm Security Administration has successfully conducted throughout its history?

Mr. RUSSELL. They forget them, or they do not care to discuss them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that 92 percent of the indebtedness in connection with loans in the rehabilitation effort has been paid back?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is referring to the rehabilitation loans, is he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. I say, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction, that in view of the credit risk which is assumed in making such loans, the collection record is nothing short of phenomenal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator to the fact that he has exhausted 15 minutes of his time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will take time on the bill, Mr. President. In the matter of farm tenant loans to farm tenants to enable them to buy farms, the payments last year, including advance payments, represent about 150 percent of the maturities. Bear that in mind. The borrowers in many instances have anticipated the maturities on those loans. Approximately 99 percent of all the borrowers are current, and have met their maturities as they fell due. Where can we find a similar record in any other lending activity of the Government, when we consider the fact that the farmer, above all other people in this country, is subject to distress from the elements and from insects, and is most likely of all to suffer failure of his income in any given year?

We now come down to the rural rehabilitation loans. I should be the last to say that there have not been made many loans which were too large. Undoubtedly, in dealing with this problem involving about a million different farm families in approximately 2,300 counties of the United States, excessive loans have been made in many instances. Let me say, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, if the facts could be thoroughly sifted it would be found that as many loans had failed because they were not quite large enough as had failed because they were too large. Where a man has no energy or ambition, as—I do not wish to be personal—our friend, Sandy Garrett evidently has not, of course, he will not repay his loan. But, Mr. President, I say that we are dealing with people in this loan program who have never had a chance to live, and if 75 percent of them were put on their feet as independent, self-sustaining, valuable members of society, the money lost on the other 25 percent would be the best investment the United States has ever made since the beginning of its history.

The record as to rehabilitation loans shows that for the current year, including prepayments, the collections will amount to 93 percent. I wish to point out that when these farmers have as good a year as they had last year they are just about as good a credit risk as anyone else in this Nation. Last year, there was loaned them ninety-seven and one-half million dollars, and \$131,000,000 was collected. Of course, a great deal of it was past due, but it showed that the persons to whom the loans were made appreciated them, and that when they had the money

at least a great majority of them would pay it back as willingly, Mr. President, as would you or I.

Mr. President, I believe in this program. It has had faults, weaknesses, and maladministration, but its objectives are too important to the perpetuity of our institutions of government for us to strike this program down by adopting such an amendment as that which is now pending. I ask Senators to go out, if they will, into the areas where the sharecroppers and tenants are found. I have lived amongst them all of my life. I have seen them, Mr. President, move their little chattels and one-horse wagons in the fall to another farm and start making a new crop with a landlord who was not able to finance them and without any means of credit for themselves. I have seen children who could not go to school until the period of what is called the lay-by time in the summer, which is between the time of cultivating the crops and harvesting them. The next year history repeats itself, and when the children have reached 17 or 18 years of age they leave home, marry, and start a new crop of sharecroppers and tenant farmers who live almost without hope in a country which is supposed to be the hope of the world. We cannot afford to strike those people down. They are entitled at least to one chance in life. If there is one Sandy Garrett, there are thousands of others who offset him, who are standing on their feet today, owing no man, or the Government of the United States, making an honest contribution to the war effort through the production of food, and holding their heads high as independent American citizens.

Mr. President, this amendment should be rejected and the Senate should adopt the committee proposal which provides perhaps for an appropriation smaller than it should be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to propound an inquiry to the Senator from Georgia. As I understand, the amendment provides for liquidation of the cooperatives, or whatever they may be termed, whether poorly or well managed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Whether poorly or well managed, it provides for the liquidation of them all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to comment on what the distinguished Senator has said in connection with grants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will then be speaking on his own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would time be available to me at any later time on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, under the agreement the Senator is entitled to only one speech on the bill, of not exceeding 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in 1940, when a hurricane struck, and great tracts of agricultural land in South Carolina and along the coast were destroyed,

as Governor of the State of South Carolina, I made every effort through various agencies in Washington, to obtain funds. Through the Disaster Loan Corporation I obtained some funds, and also through the F. S. A. Had it not been for the grants and loans made by the F. S. A. many hundreds of farmers, who today are producing for the war effort in South Carolina, would not be there.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia well remembers, as do other Senators, that in the summer of 1941 there was no agency of Government connected with agriculture or otherwise that was willing to lend money or to assist the farmers of South Carolina. During that summer and fall more than 30,000 farmers, as shown by the records in the department, received aid and were able to carry on. Today many of them are producing for the war effort. Many of them were more than rehabilitated. Their sons, as well as the sons of others, are in the Army today.

Mr. President, I hope that if the co-operatives shall be liquidated, the Senate will appropriate sufficient money for the only organization of Government I know of, so far as the farmer is concerned, which has always been ready and willing to help the fellow at the bottom of the ladder so that some day he may reach the top.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I helped in the preparation of the appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe I understand the purposes of the appropriation for Farm Security.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] stated the truth. It is the one agency of the Federal Government which really helps him who needs help. How many millions of dollars have been advanced or loaned to industrialists or to men who actually had credit in the normal places of credit?

The Farm Security Administration has been denounced as communistic. I deny that. I believe that the rehabilitation feature of Farm Security is one which keeps the farmer from being communistic.

Mr. President, there is nothing which the American loves and adores more than a home. Give the average American citizen a piece of land and a roof over the heads of his children, and he will not be a Communist. Unless we continue such an agency as Farm Security and the policy it tries to carry out, communism may rear its head.

I have no fear as to the winning of the war, because we are going to win it; I am not at all concerned with the Nazis or the Japs, because we are going to whip them; but I am concerned with millions of American farmers, and millions of other Americans throughout the entire country, who have not had homes. Do Senators realize that of the 7,000,000 farmers in this country only 50 percent of them can say, "This is my home; this is my property"? And here is the Government, with a sound policy, trying to rehabilitate American citizens, advancing them a little credit which they cannot get elsewhere.

Ask a farmer in Tennessee, or Arkansas, or New Mexico with 2 acres of land and an old mule, to go to a local banker

and see how much he can get. He will not get a dime. Is there an obligation on the Government to aid such a citizen? That citizen furnishes soldiers, he furnishes the ones who make the supreme sacrifice. He certainly is entitled to a little help, which is all he wants. He wants a little help in order to enable him to carry on so that he may eventually, through his efforts, be able to say, "This is my place. I am a free citizen of the country. I pay taxes, I send my children to school, I produce for the war effort, I am a member of society." What is the matter with the Farm Security Administration when we consider a situation such as that?

Transfer the functions of the Farm Security to other agencies of the Government, as is contemplated by some of the amendments proposed, and what would happen? I know about the agencies of the Government. Many of them would not look at a farmer, especially if he were poor, and perhaps did not own a piece of land. The Farm Security Administration has a heart, a heart which Americans revere, and the organization is doing a fine job.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Virginia may be rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I listened to an address the other evening over the radio by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, and with many things in his address I agreed. One thing brought out in this radio talk was the fact that the former President, the Food Administrator during the last war, predicted in a most serious tone that there would be a food shortage in this country this year. That opinion is shared by many prominent persons, because of a number of factors which exist at the present time.

I hope these persons are wrong, but I am not going to do anything in the way of legislation which in my opinion will curtail the production of food one iota in connection with the war effort. Whatever prejudice I may have against the Farm Security Administration, whatever prejudice I may have against Mr. Baldwin, a gentleman who I think should be out of office, and I hope that at sometime soon he will be removed from his office; whatever prejudice I may have with respect to the resettlement propositions which have been discussed on the floor of the Senate—and I have heard the same type and kind of argument for the last 3 or 4 years—I shall not permit such feelings to affect my vote in this particular case.

Mr. President, I know that the Farm Bureau Federation in my section of the country is against this proposition. The Farm Bureau Federation has been my friend, and I am a member of the organization at the present time in my own county in Illinois. But here again I must differ with them, because of what I see in connection with the production of food not only for soldiers, but for civilians as well.

It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that between 400,000 and 500,000 families are affected through this type of legislation. I undertake to say that if the House provision should become law it would seriously cripple

the production of food, which is being carried on by the group of farmers whom the pending legislation seeks to aid.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia, to see whether or not the article I am about to read is correct, because to me it says a great deal, and it has helped me make up my mind in connection with my vote on the pending bill. The article says:

We are making a big thing of importing 5,000 farm workers from the Bahamas. Here are 500,000 farm families, our citizen brothers, who have been helped by farm security loans to a point where they produced last year 36 percent of the national increase in milk, 23 percent of the national increase in dried beans, and 10 percent in eggs and chickens, though they number but 7.6 percent of the Nation's farmers.

I should like to know whether or not there is any Senator who cares to challenge those figures, or agree with them, because they are extremely important. They are taken from an item written by Mr. Samuel Grafton for the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1943. Does the Senator from Georgia know anything about those figures?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, those figures are in accord with the figures submitted by the witnesses appearing before the committee, and I had adverted to them briefly by saying it was a fine thing having that much of a percentage of increase come from 450,000 farmers out of a total of 6,000,000, and particularly those who were supposed to be less privileged.

I do not think there can be any doubt that the chief field of increased production of commodities of the nature alluded to is among farm security borrowers, because there is no available labor for the farmers elsewhere. There are farmers who do not have the facilities with which to proceed, but who can produce if we give them supervision and credit with which to purchase the chickens and the cows and hogs in order to produce the pork and the milk and the eggs and the poultry which are needed.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, and I wish to say one word in conclusion.

I know nothing about how the program is administered in other States, but insofar as the State of Illinois is concerned, in my opinion the program has been administered in a very efficient and economical manner, although I have heard many stories to the contrary as affecting other sections of the country.

There is one thing the Committee on Appropriations has done in connection with this matter; it has taken into consideration the very thing I have been discussing, and has dealt with the question accordingly, in my humble opinion.

Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Wisconsin today speak of the lack of help, assistance, and when the farmers are crying for help we find the Bankhead law assisting individuals on the farms in order to increase the production of food.

We hear the suggestion constantly being made by Members of Congress that the Army be allowed to help produce the food for the coming year. So far as I am concerned, when I see this dilemma

in front of me with respect to the food situation I cannot reach the conclusion, merely because of some prejudice, because of some feeling in the past, because of some individual in a bureau who is not administering the law perhaps in the way it should be administered, that I should deny between 400,000 and 500,000 farmers of America the right to continue to obtain rehabilitation loans in order to help them produce the food which this Nation needs, both for the military and for the civilian population next year.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in behalf of the situation which obtains in my State. The picture is a very sad one. According to the 1940 Census, Mississippi has 335,939 farm families. Of that number, only 97,226 are owners of their farms. Of the total number of farm families in Mississippi, 192,815 are farm tenants. There are 45,594 farm laborers. They are not tenants. They work by the day. In other words, there are 238,413 homeless farm families in Mississippi out of a total of 335,939 farm families. There are over 240,000 farm families who, according to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] cannot sing Home Sweet Home.

The Farm Security Administration has come to the relief of over 25,000 of these homeless farm families in my State, and of that number, 2,600 are applicants for farm ownership. The only reason there are not more applicants for the ownership of farms is that not sufficient money has been made available by the Congress to make the loans to the 240,000 homeless farm families in Mississippi.

I am glad to report that the 2,600 clients of the Farm Security Administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act program have paid 96½ percent of their indebtedness, and during the last year their payments have exceeded their obligations.

Mr. President, while the picture in my State possibly is gloomier than that in any other State in the Union, I wish to plead with my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and to stand by the committee provision so as to make available this gracious service to the 240,000 homeless farm families in my State.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have heard all the moving and pathetic pleas which have been made in defense of the committee amendment. They range all the way from Home Sweet Home to Nearer My God to Thee. All those who make the pleas, however, omit one important fact. It costs our Government \$1 to loan or give away \$3 through the F. S. A. Any agency which spends that much money in overhead is careless and extravagant, and reflects upon the Government and the activity which it represents, and upon the Congress, and it ought to be abolished.

I shall vote for the Byrd amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Do I correctly understand that under his amendment there will still be available \$50,000,000 for the purposes

which have been referred to, only that the money will be distributed by the Farm Credit Administration instead of the Farm Security Administration? I do not understand that the Senator, by his amendment, is doing away with rural rehabilitation loans.

Mr. BYRD. The amount is \$40,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Forty million dollars, plus twelve million dollars; is that not true?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. A total of \$52,000,000 would still be available for the meritorious purposes which have been referred to?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. TAFT. Is that not more than sufficient to carry any family which is already receiving help, and also aid a large number of new families which are not now receiving help?

Mr. BYRD. I certainly think so.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I feel a measure of guilt, after having served for days on end with the very able Senator from Georgia on the committee which had been giving consideration to this annual agricultural supply bill, because I have not felt equal to pitching in and helping him carry at least a small share of his burden. Perhaps it is as well that I have not been taking any part in it, because, after all is said and done, the Senator from Georgia, it must be admitted, has done an amazing job. No one can better appreciate that than those who serve on a committee dealing with such a bill as this. After the House had virtually rewritten the legislation, and destroyed so many features that we have fought year after year to win, it was not a simple matter to sit down and deal with the hundreds upon hundreds of items in the bill that had to be dealt with separately. The Senator from Georgia has won my utmost appreciation not only by the manner in which he has represented the committee on the floor of the Senate, but by the manner in which he conducted the very difficult hearings and the writing of the bill.

Mr. President, since the life of the so-called Byrd committee, I have served as a member of the committee with the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I know how utter is his sincerity of purpose in the objective of his amendment. I should like to go along with him in support of the larger purpose he and his committee have been serving, but I must depart from him completely as respects his recommendations concerning the future of F. S. A.

A year or so ago, when that committee submitted its recommendations to the Senate, including a recommendation involving the abandonment of the F. S. A., I concurred in the report, except that feature of it dealing with F. S. A., because I had come as closely as anyone could come to intimate acquaintance with the work the F. S. A. was doing.

I cannot now go along with the Senator on his amendment. I cannot do other than insist in my own small way that the Senate stand by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its recom-

mendations with respect to the future of the Farm Security Administration. With all its failures and in spite of all the criticism for which it has given cause, I hope that the purpose served by the Farm Security Administration is here to stay, not only this year, but through the years to come, for it has served in a field which had too long been ignored.

The Farm Security Administration has brought returns which are altogether good for our Nation. So broad a claim as this, of course, is bound to invite a flood of challenges built around faults and failures, most of which I would readily acknowledge. F. S. A. has been guilty of playing favorites. F. S. A. has extended help to some who have been undeserving. F. S. A. has engaged in some foolish experimentation, and has given cause for charges of contributing to collectivism and regimentation. F. S. A. has caused some persons to abandon initiative and resign themselves to a dependence upon government. All this I will admit. But these faults and failures have been so largely remedied and eliminated and have been so insignificant by comparison with the great services rendered deserving individuals that I entertain firm belief that the agency of F. S. A. can be made to win returns which will afford and hold vast advantages to our whole country.

Without the help which F. S. A. made available in my own and other States during recent trying years I know that we should be facing terrible need and failure on every hand. Instead of that, and largely because of F. S. A., I can point to hundreds of successful farm operations today, hundreds of farm families who have been helped to their feet, making tremendous contributions to the food needs of their country in this emergency, and paying not only their real estate and personal taxes but paying income taxes to the Federal Government as well.

In the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee will be found merely a very few of the evidences which have come to me of the part which F. S. A. has played in rehabilitating able, deserving farm people who had been all but destroyed by drought and adverse economic conditions. Endless are the personal cases I could recite for the Senate's information demonstrating how people who were hopelessly down and out were saved by F. S. A., given the help in dollars they needed, who have paid back every penny they borrowed and are now most productive parts of our national economy.

There is much room for administrative improvement in the conduct of F. S. A. It is the duty of Congress to force those improvements and hasten elimination of the faults and weaknesses of the administration. But it certainly does not follow that we must abandon an agency which today is playing so vital a part in our economy as F. S. A. has done and is doing. Some persons will insist that there is no such need for F. S. A. today as there once was. Of course, that is the case, but there still is room for it, and who knows when there

might exist as vital a need for it again as there was before.

I hope the Senate will stand with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the committee. In the committee we have gone into the subject with thoroughness. We find such vast advantages growing out of what F. S. A. has done and such large repayment of the loans which are being made that we feel secure in the belief that this agency can carry itself with little or no loss to the Government ultimately.

Let me, while on my feet, give expression of my appreciation to the approval by the Senate of the committee's action on the issue of crop insurance, the removal of the prohibition on sales of wheat below parity, the issue of increased appropriation for soil conservation, the proposal to make R. A. C. C. incentive loans, and other most important matters, including the authorizing of parity payment on crops of next year. Only by these policies are we going to build an agricultural industry sufficiently strong to withstand the tests which are upon the industry now and which are certain to follow this war.

I should be unfair to myself if I did not, here and now, pay my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Never have I known a Senator so thoroughly to acquaint himself with the hundreds of problems presented by an agricultural appropriation bill. The Senate has had occasion to observe during recent days the splendid knowledge and efficiency of the Senator from Georgia. To have worked with him, hour after hour, upon this bill, and to have had a hand in accomplishing the gains won in the bill has been both a great pleasure and an honor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Virginia; and in support of the amendment recommended by the full Appropriations Committee. It should be borne in mind that the service rendered by the Farm Security Administration has been rendered to those at the bottom of the rural economic ladder. They are the group in this country who, prior to the time when the Farm Security Administration's assistance and credit were made available to them, had no hope of improving their economic status insofar as their own existence or the future of their children were concerned. They are the group, Mr. President, who as the Senator from Georgia so well said, probably would have been considered the poorest credit risks to be found in the United States. Yet, while this program has been in operation, more than 1,500,000 families have received help of some type from the Farm Security Administration. Credit has been furnished to approximately 935,000 families so as to enable them to obtain livestock, equipment, and other essentials they need in order to operate their farms. Trained county supervisors have advised them on their farm and home plans. Those plans call for the production of two or more war-essential foods for market, food and feed

needed at home, and for cash income needed to furnish their necessities and to pay their debts.

Mr. President, it is a misnomer to call this fund an administrative fund in the sense that an administrative fund is ordinarily considered as an administrative expense. As the junior Senator from Georgia has said, the plan has been as much a farm vocational-educational program as it has been a credit program; and only as adequate supervision and assistance of a technical nature are given to those families who previously have had no opportunity, has it been possible for them to be rehabilitated and to repay their interest and principal. Therefore, to condemn the program on the basis of a statement that it costs \$1 in supervision for every \$2 loaned, which I do not concede to be true, is to indicate an utter lack of understanding of the entire program.

My fear is that the Committee on Appropriations has cut this fund too deeply, and that as a result the proper supervision and technical assistance may not be sufficiently available. To the extent that such assistance fails, to that extent will the loans fail, and to that extent will the program fail.

The plan of providing credit with personal guidance has worked well. Many farm families were in desperate circumstances, unable to obtain credit from any source, until the Farm Security Administration gave them assistance. With such help and by their own hard work they had repaid, by December 31, 1942, nearly \$338,000,000 of the approximately \$712,000,000 of loans which have been made.

Mr. President, in the face of that record, I say that the evidence presented to the House committee, the evidence presented to the Byrd committee, and the evidence presented to the Appropriations Committee shrink into insignificance. It consists of a few flyspecks which have been gathered up out of the mistakes which must have been made in a program of such great magnitude, dealing with persons without sufficient farm management experience and, in many cases, without sufficient education.

I say that in relation to the constructive achievements which have been realized in making better American citizens, the evidence presented against the F. S. A. to the House committee, to the Senate committee, and to the Byrd committee should not be dignified by giving it attention. Ninety percent of it would not have been admitted in a police court anywhere in the United States. Ninety percent of it is of the most hearsay character of any alleged evidence I have ever heard or read.

The total repayments, including advance payments, amount to 91 percent of the maturities. Repayments, excluding advance payments, were 85.5 percent of maturities. Approximately 200,000 families have repaid their loans in full. Let that fact soak into the minds of Senators. Two hundred thousand families who, before the Farm Security Administration gave them assistance, were at the bottom of the rural agricultural ladder have repaid in full the loans

which have been extended to them by that organization.

Mr. President, I say that such a record compares favorably with the loan record of any private insurance or other agency operating over a similar period of time with similar clients.

These borrowers are not only repaying well, but they are also recovering their position as self-reliant farmers. I say to my conservative friends in this body, on both sides of the aisle, that it is shocking to me to see them band together to tear down an agency which, upon the admitted facts, has been restoring the hope of equality of economic opportunity which made this country great, and which makes men believe in and willing to die for democracy.

If we wish to create in this country such a condition that radicalism will find fertile soil, just allow the tendency adverse to individual ownership of the land by the people, which has been progressing since the turn of the century, to proceed to its logical conclusion. Permit the industrialization and mechanization of agriculture to continue to its logical conclusion, and we shall pave the way for communism or fascism in this Nation. If we want to maintain the moral fiber of democracy while we are fighting abroad on the military fronts and on the seven seas of the world, do not strike down an agency which is enabling so many people to restore their belief that there is a measure of opportunity in this country for men and their families to rise above the level of squalor and poverty.

The Farm Security Administration has not only been doing the job of rehabilitating farmers in America, but it has been doing an amazing and outstanding job in increasing food production. A survey of the 1942 food-production records of 463,941 farmers shows that this group, which made up only 7.6 percent of all the farmers in the United States, supplied 36 percent of all the increased milk production; 27 percent of all the increased production of dried beans; 10 percent of all the additional chickens, eggs, and peanuts produced; 9 percent of the increased pork production; 7 percent of the increase in the production of beef and sugar beets; and 3 percent of the increased production of soybeans.

Shall we strike down an agency which has been enabling a relatively few farmers in the United States to contribute so greatly to the need for increased food for our armed forces, for the lend-lease requirements, and for the civilian population? I say that this great record is indisputable. The survey was made under the supervision of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; and no Senator in his right mind will question the professional statistical character and standing of that Bureau of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the total increases for a number of food products.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increases in production of essential crop and livestock products between 1941 and 1942, by all farmers and by Farm Security Administration borrowers¹

Product	All farmers		Farm Security Administration borrowers		Percent of net increase by all farmers contributed by Farm Security Administration borrowers
	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	
Milk (pounds).....	3,914,000,000	3	1,419,000,000	20	36
Pork (pounds liveweight).....	² 2,252,000,000	13	192,400,000	36	9
Eggs (dozen).....	516,000,000	15	49,800,000	31	10
Beef (pounds liveweight).....	² 1,767,000,000	11	124,300,000	38	7
Chickens (pounds liveweight).....	² 366,365,000	14	37,100,000	36	10
Peanuts (pounds).....	1,028,000,000	70	101,700,000	88	10
Soybeans (bushel).....	104,000,000	98	3,360,000	106	3
Dry beans (pounds).....	110,500,000	6	30,100,000	34	27
Sugar beets (tons).....	1,616,000	16	113,000	24	7

Total number of all farmers..... 6,097,000
 Number of actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers producing in 1942..... 463,941
 Proportion of all farmers who were actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers (percent)..... 7.6

¹ Based on a survey, approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of records of Farm Security Administration borrowers at the end of the 1942 crop year.

² Preliminary unpublished Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates of commercial slaughter plus home use. Chicken figures include commercial broilers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the value of the Farm Security Administration has not been limited to the direct contribution which farm families are now making to the war effort. The F. S. A. borrowers not only are growing large quantities of scarce foods for America; they are not only repaying their loans well, but also are recovering their position as self-reliant farmers. They will bulwark the Nation for the years to come. By the end of 1941 the net worth of the average farm security rehabilitation borrower, the value of what he owned over what he owed, had risen 43 percent since the time they came under this program. The actual net worth of the families, which averaged \$871 before they received F. S. A. help, had increased by 1941 to \$1,242. Does anyone think that families which have gone through that experience are on the road to communism? No, they are on the road to Americanism.

I say that it is a blind and destructive conservatism which would strike down the achievements of an agency which is making a record of this kind—a record which cannot be successfully disputed. All that can be found against the F. S. A., after the expenditure of considerable sums of money, is the kind of tripe appearing in the record of the House committee, the Senate committee, and the Byrd committee. I stated before, and I repeat, that such evidence would not be admitted in a police court in a trial for stealing a chicken.

The net family income had increased an average of 80 percent, or from \$480 to \$865. The families had learned to grow and conserve more food for the family table. The \$327 worth of home-used food produced in 1941 was almost exactly double the \$163 worth which the family had been accustomed to using. Does anyone think that children brought up in such an improved dietary situation will make less desirable American citizens? Does anyone think that they will be less willing to die for American democracy on some far-flung battlefield?

I say that this is an activity of the Government of which every true American may well be proud. In my judgment,

it is the kind of activity which must be encouraged and developed in this country. We must restore the measure of equality of economic opportunity which existed when we had a great public domain, which could be thrown open to exploitation and use, where individuals and their families could go and take up new land and acquire an economic stake in America. It is the closing of the door of economic opportunity by the exhaustion of the physical frontier and by the development of modern industry that threatens democracy in America. It is not foreign propaganda. Developments of an inexorable economic nature are taking place right here at home.

Of course there have been mistakes in this program. There is not a Senator who, if he had been appointed to administer it, would not have made mistakes. How are we going to help the people at the bottom of the rural economic ladder without sometimes making mistakes? The opponents of the Farm Security Administration ought to develop more than one case to embalm in the records of the Senate for 2 years in succession—the case of some poor fellow in Alabama who missed the boat.

Farm planning and sound credit have been accompanied by other types of aid. More than 117,000 farm families, or 615,000 persons in 1,071 counties of 39 States, through medical plans worked out with physicians, are receiving medical care at a cost which they can afford to pay. Does it make them Communists to give them some medical care, to stop some of the ravages of disease which has taken such a horrible toll in infant and maternal mortality in this group at the bottom of the rural economic ladder in America? I say no. A thousand times no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will take time on the bill.

I say that we are helping to build better American citizens, who will have greater love for their country than they would have had if they had grown up

suffering from rickets, or with teeth missing, or afflicted with some other disease caused by rural poverty.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield briefly.

Mr. BONE. I wonder what would happen to some of our institutions in America if by congressional action we should blot them out if they should make financial mistakes. I have been watching the newspapers lately, and they are all singing hymns of praise now for the holding companies in the utility field. Their admitted business operations would give a polecat convulsions. They have cost the people of the country billions of dollars. The whole crowd ought to have been in the penitentiary for their maladroit operations.

According to the theory advanced here, because the F. S. A. has made some mistakes, we should incontinently blot it out. On that theory we ought to destroy all the holding companies in the utility field, without a single exception. If we are to enthrone in America the philosophy that an institution which makes some financial blunders is to be blotted out, a novel theory will be established in American political practice. I am glad to see that we are tending in that direction. It will make everyone very careful from now on.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Washington that I think the amazement we should express in viewing this great constructive record should be that there have been so little loss and so few mistakes in comparison with the size of the program and the disadvantages of the people involved.

Complaint has been made that some rehabilitation borrowers have been given grants. Grants have been given only on the same basis as grants were given to other farmers. Should an individual who had borrowed a little money and who had a crop failure or sickness be denied relief because of that situation?

Criticism has also been made where borrowers have had hard luck, and were not able to make the grade in a particular year, but there was still hope for their being rehabilitated, and the F. S. A. issued additional notes to take up their delinquency and the interest due. This is a common practice of every commercial loan institution in the United States, and yet because it is done for a poor indigent farmer in America it has been denounced here as an uneconomic practice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator referred to losses which had been sustained. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia places the administration under the seed loan and production loan officials.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, I was wishing I had those figures, and I hope the Senator will put them in the RECORD, because I myself thought it would be fine to put them in now.

Mr. RUSSELL. This organization has done a good work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. But these are un-subservient loans. From 1918, when they were made, down to 1940, the repayments amounted to 64 percent as compared with an average of more than 86 percent by the Farm Security Administration.

In the years of 1938, 1939, and 1940, which were reasonably good crop years, the average for those years was 78.92 percent as compared with an average of more than 86 percent over a longer period by the Farm Security Administration, and 93 percent for last year, which shows that not a great deal would be gained by placing this in the seed-loan class. We must also bear in mind that those who borrow from the seed-loan fund have to give a chattel-mortgage on their personal property before they can obtain the money, whereas the other borrowers start from scratch.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, and it has been suggested that the limit of \$800 should be raised for these seed loans. I shall vote for it, but every Senator knows that no small farmer needs to borrow \$800 for seed for 1 single year. Let us be frank about it, Mr. President. To adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would be to kill the service which has been rendered to the farmers at the bottom of the rural economic ladder in America. It would deny them credit; and that is said without any criticism whatsoever of the Farm Credit Administration or the farm-production associations, or any other of the organizations mentioned in the Senator's amendment. They are not equipped, they are not in a position, to render the kind of service which has been rendered by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, voluntary debt adjustments have been made with the creditors of more than 107,000 farmers to enable them to carry on. That means that approximately 107,000 farm families have been saved from losing their farms as a result of the voluntary credit work done by this organization.

About 201,000 families are sharing the cost of farm machinery, sires, and other farm-improvement services. More than 17,000 of these services have been successfully undertaken with Farm Security Administration loans.

Mr. President, with all the criticism which can be made of F. S. A., with all the evidence, hearsay or otherwise, which has been dragged in against this organization, this magnificent record of constructive rehabilitation of great numbers of American farm families, and their restoration to self-respecting positions in our society, stand out like a mountain peak against a molehill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have already discussed the amendment offered by me, and I shall take only a few more minutes of the time of the Senate.

I wish to take sharp issue with the Senator from Wisconsin in his statement that the amendment offered by me would deny any aid to the low-income group of farmers. That, Mr. President, is simply not correct, because the emergency

Crop and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration has now made 1,491,655 loans to low-income-group farmers in this country, limited in this instance to \$400. To say that the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia to transfer the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration under the administration of the Crop and Feed Loan Division will deny all loans to the low-income group of farmers is simply not correct.

Mr. President, I wish only to refer to another statement which has been made, and that is with respect to the cost of the Farm Security Administration.

The Treasury records show that from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, there had been loaned \$576,000,000, in round figures, and grants amounting to \$137,000,000 had been made, or a total of \$714,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to state to the Senator that my information, which I am sure is correct, is that the Farm Security Administration did not come into being until September 1937; but the Senator is using the figures of 1935.

Mr. BYRD. I am using the figures of the rural rehabilitation program of the F. S. A. and its predecessor agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then that is a correct statement.

Mr. BYRD. The cost of their personnel, such as salaries, was \$198,000,000, and so forth—an aggregate of \$275,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, some reference has been made to the percentage of loans which are current. I merely wish again to invite the attention of the Senate to what I referred to this morning, namely, that Mr. Baldwin testified that when in many instances these borrowers became delinquent in their installments new notes were taken, and the loans would then be declared current. So I submit that the figures which have been given in percentages cannot have any real validity.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia proposes—as has been fully discussed—to transfer the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration, and to operate it through the existing Crop and Feed Loan Division and the production credit associations.

It provides for an appropriation of \$12,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service to provide such farm and home management assistance as it may be necessary to borrow. That \$8,000,000 compares with \$16,000,000 which I understand is available under the Farm Security appropriation proposed.

It is then proposed to make available \$40,000,000 of loans. Let us recall that now perhaps there is not as great need for these new loans as there has been in the past and, while this is a reduction in the loans made available, yet under the conditions which now exist, if these

loans are soundly administered, \$40,000,000 will be sufficient, in my opinion.

I do not desire to take further time, as I know the Senator from Georgia is anxious to dispose of the pending proposal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to claim the floor for a brief time, largely for the purpose of asking a question or two of the Senator from Georgia which I shall be glad to have him answer in my time, as to the general purport of the committee amendment. It may be that it will be retracing some ground which the Senator from Georgia has covered during my necessary temporary absence from the floor.

I have discussed this matter many times privately with the Senator from Georgia, and I say frankly, in asking the questions, that it has been my observation that the consensus of opinion in my own State, on the part of those who have had opportunity of observing the operations of the Farm Security Administration, is that nearly everyone is in favor of continuing and perpetuating the functions of that Administration, but that nearly everyone complains about the extravagance and waste in the Administration, and certain communistic tendencies in some sections of my State and in other sections of the United States, doubtless inherited from the Tugwellian administration of the predecessor agency.

I can best express the consensus of opinion I have had by reading a letter, very briefly, from the editor of the Missouri Farmer, the organ of the Missouri Farmers Association, the greatest farm agency in the State of Missouri, one of the greatest in the United States, and one of the greatest farm cooperatives in the United States, Mr. H. E. Kleinfelter, who is also the head of the legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers Association. He says:

We knew that Farm Security Administration was involved in the bill, although we did not understand all the angles at this distance from Washington, nor was there time for us to investigate. We realized Farm Security Administration needed drastic pruning—it, too, is an overgrown bureaucracy—but we were in possession of no facts to pass judgment on it. Common sense tells one that less relief is needed during current times.

Farm Security Administration, with all its faults, has helped many a poor devil who had been turned away by everybody else, and we are wondering if some means has been provided in the bill to continue this aid—to those who are now struggling up the economic ladder, and aid to those who will need it badly after the war ends?

Mr. President, in view of the fact that nearly everyone in the country is in favor of continuing the functions, the professed objectives, of the Farm Security Administration, continuing the good work they have done, as Mr. Kleinfelter says, of helping many a poor devil up the hill when he could not get relief anywhere else; also in view of the fact that nearly everyone in the whole United States is opposed to the waste and extravagance which have undoubtedly

been existent in the administration of this office, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia, even if he has already done so, in my time to explain what provisions of the Senate amendment make correction of the existing conditions in this agency, particularly what suggestion there may be for correcting the extravagant tendencies of Mr. Baldwin. The Senator knows I discussed this matter with him several times, and I think the Senator knows my position on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I understand the Senator's position, and we are not far apart. We are in practical agreement as to our objective.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator that in our private discussions I thought we were in entire agreement, but when I read the amendment the Senator brought in from his committee, unless the Senator can make some further explanation of it, I am not at all certain we agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say that there is no stronger friend of the Farm Security Administration than I have been, but I think there have been some people in the Farm Security Administration who have seized the rehabilitation program as an occasion for presenting their own views as to the organization of farmers and the manner in which farm labor should be handled.

As to migratory labor and the camps, last year the provision for the Farm Security Administration specifically authorized them to administer such camps in certain sections of the country. That is eliminated from the Senate committee amendment this year. There is nothing in the bill, no appropriation, authorizing the Farm Security to deal with the migratory labor problem. It is now being handled by an officer of the Army and Mr. Chester Davis, under the provisions of the special labor act, with which the Senator is familiar. That relates to one question at issue which was raised by the Senator's correspondent. It did not make any difference how earnest many of the Farm Security officials might have been to promulgate ideas out of harmony with those of the Senator or with my ideas, it is another matter when it comes to dealing with the ordinary farmer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not trying to insist on my views being followed by any governmental agency, but I do not wish to appropriate money for a governmental agency with which to propagandize its own views or to compel its own views in violation of the general practice and of existing law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That refers to one question raised by the Senator. The farm migratory labor and the camps and the handling of the labor have been entirely divorced from the Farm Security Administration by the pending bill and the preceding act.

The Senator referred to extravagance. The total funds carried for the current year, 1943, direct appropriations and re-appropriations for administration and for grants, was \$41,986,743. The Senate committee bill carries \$29,607,573. This is a reduction of more than \$12,000,000.

I say that that is a very drastic reduction in the administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree that is a very substantial and very meritorious reduction. The only question in my mind is that the Senate committee apparently has made no restriction on the use of the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have had many bills presented for this agency in the past, showing they have spent exorbitant sums in telephone charges and telegraph charges, in addition to the enormous use of the franking privilege. It seems to me all those matters are things which are fairly subject to congressional review and reduction.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's committee has made a very excellent and a very drastic reduction in over-all administrative expenses, but, as I understand, it is still left to the discretion of the administrative agency, which at the time is Mr. Baldwin, as to how the money shall be expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any item in the bill which is broken down into dollars and cents for communications and travel. Such appropriations are always in lump sums.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that, but it seems to me that in the case of this agency the appropriation could be broken down, and some restrictions should be put on the amount which can be squandered for telephone and telegraph bills, which I use only as an example.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that when we cut an appropriation over 25 percent, there must be some reductions in expenses all along the line.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It might be that in making the adjustment within the total appropriation allowed by Congress there was too much allocated for travel.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that has certainly been true in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that the committee amendment, so far as the activities of the Farm Security Administration are concerned, is much more restrictive than the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Georgia thinks he can convince me of that I shall be glad to have him attempt to do so in my time, and if he convinces me I shall vote for the committee amendment rather than for the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not more restrictive as to amount. Of course, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia reduces the amount very drastically. What I am talking about is the operations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me interrupt the Senator from Georgia to state my position, which is, that so far as I am concerned, I am willing to appropriate every penny that is needed to carry out the proper functions of this agency, but I wish the money to be expended on the performance of the functions, rather than

being squandered in administrative expenses. I have been informed that over the period since the creation of this agency, that is the present agency and its predecessor agencies, nearly \$1 has been spent for administrative expenses for every \$2 either loaned or granted by the agency. Does the Senator know whether that is true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know it is incorrect as to the F. S. A.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The figures which are furnished me—and I have them from several different sources—show that from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the Farm Security Administration and its predecessors have cost the Government by way of administrative expenses a total of \$275,861,889.27, in order to make loans and grants totaling \$714,092,031.52. That is not exactly in proportion of 1 to 2, but it is almost in that proportion. Does the Senator think there is any justification for such a proportion of administrative expense?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think so at all. The one thing that I have thought to be unfair all the way through in connection with consideration of the Farm Security Administration—and heaven knows the Farm Security Administration has done enough that is subject to criticism, without bringing it in—is the fact that the doings of the predecessor to the Farm Security Administration, under Tugwell and others, have all been bundled up and tied in with the figures of the F. S. A. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I take issue with the Senator from Georgia on that point, because it is the Tugwellian influence, if I may use that expression, in the Farm Security Administration, which is really a subject for debate here. As to many of the activities of the Farm Security Administration no one takes issue. It is the chimerical projects, and excessive use of the telephone and telegraph and other extravagances and waste of money, that are subject to criticism. That is the question which is at issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a substantial reduction in travel expense and in communications expense last year. A very drastic reduction in those expenses for the next year will inevitably ensue because of the reduction of administrative expense of over 25 percent. The administrative expense of the Farm Security Administration will amount to 4.32 percent for the coming year, according to the Budget estimate. When we consider that these loans are made on a 3- to 5-year basis, and that supervision of them is in effect on the farms during the periods for which they are outstanding, I think that the percentage of expense is about as low as it can be, if there is to be assurance of collecting the money. What is lost sight of is that if \$40,000,000 is made available this year for loans, and the administrative expenses are \$15,000,000, or \$12,000,000, as proposed in the Byrd amendment, then the administrative expenses will amount to over 25 percent of the loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri on the amendment has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will take time on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Since the loans are made over a 3- or 5-year period, certainly the administrative expense should not all be charged up to any one year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not a fact that under the contemplated breakdown—I understand it is not in the bill for this year—that the travel expenses are estimated at \$5,000,000, or approximately \$5,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures before me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Georgia were to go by train to Atlanta—it may be very difficult to get a reservation on the train if he were merely a United States Senator—but if he were to get into a Pullman car, or even break into a dining car, he would find at least five or six Farm Security Agency employees sitting at the tables of the dining car comparing their notes.

It seems to me there has been an entirely exaggerated amount of administrative expense. I am not trying to be cheese-paring or nickel-pinching, or meticulous about the thing, but I still cannot see wherein the Senator from Georgia, with all respect to him and to the Appropriations Committee, has made any particular change in the administrative provisions of this measure, with the single exception of reducing the appropriation for administrative expenses, which I grant he has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is done. That is manifest. There is no other way that economy can be effected than by reducing the appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I had hoped was that when the Senator was bringing in the legislative amendment, which this admittedly is, he might have included legislation to restrict some of these obnoxious administrative practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had the experience the Senator from Missouri has had. I do not travel on trains a great deal, but I do not recall meeting Farm Security personnel on trains. They may have been on them, but they were not known as such to me. I do know that approximately 90 percent of the total travel expense allowed this year in the bill will be spent within the counties by the representatives who are servicing and supervising these loans. I do think, Mr. President, when we have an investment of so large an amount in loans we should not be too penurious with travel expenses of the men who are supervising the loans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to be too penurious, but the Senator from Georgia will be forced to admit that there has been outrageous extravagance in the administration of this agency. What I am troubled about is that there is nothing in the bill to curb the extravagance and the waste except a horizontal reduction in the appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any other way to bring about a reduction, and the Senator from Missouri does not know of any other way. If the Senator from Missouri does not regard a 25-per-

cent reduction in the total over-all expense a curbing of extravagance, I do not know what it is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I were a member of the committee and believed as the Senator from Georgia, that the Appropriations Committee has now become a legislative committee, and had a right to legislate, I think I could frame legislation which would be effective with respect to the use of the appropriation which is now being made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can express an opinion as to his belief, but he should not express the opinion that I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee is a legislative committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was simply basing my judgment on the Senator's conduct in debating the bill yesterday. I have no desire to delay action on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It so happens that a substantial majority of the committee agreed with me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are apparently in favor of the Appropriations Committee being a legislative committee.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, Americans to whom farm problems were never very vital—factory workers, salesgirls, streetcar conductors, truck drivers, and housewives—today have an enormous stake in matters affecting agriculture. Citizens from every walk of life now realize that the future of our common cause—prosecution of the war to victory and an abundant peace—depends largely upon how much food we have for our soldiers, our fighting allies, and our people here at home. Food policy is a part of United Nations strategy; it must, therefore, be patterned to meet the needs of democratic people everywhere.

The farmer, although his living depends on production of food and fiber, cannot today be the special beneficiary of our agricultural policy. He makes no such claim, I am sure; like patriotic citizens everywhere, he has pledged his land, his labor, and, if necessary, his life to victory. He is an American, first; a farmer, second. He knows that his welfare and that of our whole people are identical.

The paid professionals who in the name of the American Farm Bureau Federation claim to speak in Washington for the farmer, too often put the farmer's profits before his patriotism. In doing so they do him insult and injustice, they sabotage his unselfish service, they weaken his country's fighting strength.

In the current attack on the Farm Security Administration—an attack directed chiefly from the offices of the American Farm Bureau Federation—we have an example of the professional Farm Bureau lobby doing business as usual. It is zealous in the interests of the big farm and big plantation operators it represents, the operators who see in the war an opportunity to push the small-scale farmer off the land—to make him a tenant or a day laborer, to absorb his land into their vast holdings. It is reckless of our need for all the food the people of this land can grow.

The Farm Bureau has not demanded dismemberment of the Farm Security Administration as a means of increasing the war food supply. That would be an absurd claim to make; I doubt that even the bitterest critic of the Farm Security Administration has ever suggested that abolition of F. S. A. would give us more to eat. No one, not even the Farm Bureau contends that our war effort would be in the slightest degree furthered by the withdrawal of this assistance to small farmers.

Some do contend, however, that whatever food increase could be secured from the small farmer through F. S. A. assistance would be small and too costly. That, of course, is very different from arguing that there would be greater food production without F. S. A.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, then, has placed itself in a very strange position for a farm lobby. It is telling the public, in effect, "You cannot afford to buy more food through the F. S. A. plan."

This question is exactly the kind, I think, which should be answered by the public at large, rather than by farm interests—particularly by vested farm interests, such as the Farm Bureau, in most States represents.

I think the factory worker, the streetcar conductor, the truck driver, and the housewife should be heard on this question of how badly we want more food and how much we are willing to pay for it. They have, perhaps, a greater right to speak on this matter than do farmers themselves. Certainly their interest is more legitimate than that of a paid lobbyist whose job, as he interprets it, is to keep prices up—if necessary by keeping production down.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that in the year ending March 15, the general cost of living rose 7.4 percent, and that in that same period food prices rose 15.9 percent. Those figures have been underlined for our attention by labor unrest. Within the last month there has been one major strike and a rash of lesser ones, all of them largely attributable to rising food costs and increasing food scarcities.

In my own State, potatoes, chickens, and meat have been largely unobtainable for long periods. Due mostly to scarcities of foods, prices have risen alarmingly in the past year in large urban areas like Pittsburgh. In that metropolitan area, for instance, the retail prices of all foods advanced 18.4 percent from April 1942 to April 1943. The average price per pound of butter rose from 43.1 cents to 55.6 cents during that period. In April of last year a Pittsburgh housewife could buy a leg of lamb at 31.2 cents a pound. In April of this year she had to pay an average price of 39.3 cents. Similarly, potatoes went from 42.7 cents for 15 pounds to 77.3 cents; oranges jumped an average of 12.9 cents a dozen; and the price of apples increased by one-half. Those figures are all from the Bureau of Labor Statistics—the most reliable source.

The current O. P. A. plans to reduce the cost of living will probably actually reduce average food costs by only about 3 percent. That will leave the cost of

living still far higher than a year ago; and we are told that, even with higher prices, there still will not be enough to go around, that the shortages are only beginning.

Assuming normal weather conditions—and in view of recent weather, such an assumption is too optimistic—total food production this year will be only about 4 or 5 percent more than last, according to the Department of Agriculture. Under normal conditions crop production will be about 9 percent less than last year, while livestock production will be about 10 percent higher.

From about the same total production as last year, we shall have to send to our Army and, by lend-lease, to our allies twice as much food as we did last year—25 percent of the total food supply, rather than 12 percent. There can be no thought of short measuring those who fight by our side so valiantly.

It is in this background that we must study the questions raised by the Farm Bureau: How much can we afford to pay for more food? How much can we afford to pay for the food increases that will keep our industrial workers hard at their jobs without interruptions? How much can we afford to pay for the food increases we must give our soldiers and fighting allies?

I do not know what the Farm Bureau's answers to those questions might be. I do know that our people in the cities want utmost abundance. I know, too, that the rank and file of farmers want to grow every pound of food they possibly can grow.

The recent figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that of the country's 6,000,000 farmers, about 2,000,000 are already operating at or near capacity. Their farms, which at present are contributing about 80 percent of our total marketed agricultural production, can make almost no increases in food output unless a shift from nonfood items such as cotton and tobacco to more nutritive crops is encouraged.

At the other end of the scale, about a million and a half of the 6,000,000 farmers can make little or no increases because they farm only seasonally or are handicapped by inadequate land and other resources.

That leaves a middle group of about two and a half million farmers, of whom the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that one and a half million can make substantial increases. They have enough labor and land to handle expanded operations, but they lack credit and, to some degree, skill. Apparently, higher farm prices will not solve their problem; at least they have not yet. From 1939 to 1942, prices which farmers received rose 70 percent, but total production rose only 18 percent.

We can easily see, by examining into the distribution of income among farm families, why it is that high prices do not enable the small farmer to expand his production.

Figures provided me by the Department of Agriculture show that if we divide the 6,000,000 farms into three income groupings, each of about 2,000,000 families, the average gross income of

the upper group was \$7,370 last year—an increase of 94 percent over 1939. This upper income group—about one-third of all farmers—had money left over at the end of the year to invest in expanded capacity. The lower-income third had an average income last year of \$800—48 percent more than in 1939, but still far too little to do more than pay family living expenses and current operating costs.

It is the middle-income third with which the Farm Security Administration is largely working and it is in that group that most of the 1,500,000 small farmers whom the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says might greatly expand their output are to be found. The average gross income of those farmers last year was \$1,640—53 percent higher than in 1939. If we want to know why that group is unable to buy the livestock, fertilizer, machinery, and other supplies necessary to be had in order to expand production, we must see where that gross income of \$1,640 goes. The Department of Agriculture gives this break-down:

Three hundred and seventy-five dollars is not cash income at all; it is the value of products grown on the farm, but used at home.

Six hundred and forty-five dollars is required for current operating expenses. They include largely the cost of the things the farmer buys for business purposes.

Three hundred and ninety dollars goes for family living expenses—a very modest amount, I should say.

One hundred and sixty dollars is needed for payment on outstanding debts.

That leaves only \$70 of the family's gross income—only \$70 which can be devoted to increasing production next year. Seventy dollars is a good deal less than half enough to buy one first-class cow.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, through its Chief, has said that nearly 1,500,000 of those small farmers are in about the same situation as were F. S. A. supervised borrowers before obtaining their loans, and that they could be expected to make about the same production increases as have the F. S. A. borrowers.

If that is the case, we might expect a very great benefit to our food situation from mobilizing those small farmers into the food production army. The Farm Security borrowers made increases last year at a much greater rate than did farmers in general. Here is a partial record of their increases, as shown in a recent F. S. A. program report:

During 1942, Farm Security Administration borrowers, although comprising only 7.6 percent of all the farmers in the United States, accounted for 38 percent of the increase in milk, 17 percent of the increase in dry beans, 9 percent of the increase in eggs and chickens.

In terms of the yearly food requirements of robust American men, the 1942 increased output by Farm Security Administration borrowers would supply eggs to feed nearly 3,000,000 men, milk to feed more than 2,500,000 men, pork to feed more than 1,500,000 men.

It is evident, then, that the one and one-half million under-employed small

farmers can be assisted through the Farm Security Administration program to make very important contributions to our war food supply.

How much will it cost to secure those increases? F. S. A. experience with its 450,000 current borrowers provides the answer.

Although none of them were able to get credit from any other source, the F. S. A. borrowers have so far repaid on schedule 91 cents for every dollar loaned them. The F. S. A. has borrowed \$326,950,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation since June 1940, and it has repaid to the R. F. C. all but \$77,000,000; and that sum is secured by notes in the ratio of 5 to 1.

We must recognize, of course, that credit alone is not sufficient to secure full production from the smaller farms. The F. S. A. has been successful because it has afforded the farmer supervision and training along with loans. Probably the Agency's educational services have been as important as its credit. At any rate, the cost of giving the small farmers guidance and new skills has been somewhat less than \$35,000,000 during the year.

I think, therefore, that we should be able to decide for ourselves—without any help from the Farm Bureau—whether the Nation can afford to buy food from small farmers. Indeed, we might ask ourselves this question: Now, in wartime, when our people at home are not getting all the food they want and when a hungry world is watching us, can we afford not to tap the enormous reserve capacity of our smaller farms?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Cuffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scruggam
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chandler	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Murray	
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay." Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay" if present. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who, I am advised, would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea" if present. He is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25

Bailey	Gerry	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Tobey
Bridges	Lodge	Vandenberg
Buck	McFarland	Walsh
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Byrd	Moore	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Radcliffe	Wilson
Eastland	Revercomb	
Ferguson	Smith	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Andrews	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	Nye
Bell	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hayden	Overton
Bone	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Capper	La Follette	Shipstead
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Connally	McClellan	Van Nuys
Danaher	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	McNary	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
George	Mead	

NOT VOTING—18

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Tydings
Downey	Reynolds	Wagner
Glass	Robertson	White

So Mr. BYRD's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the first branch of the committee amendment, beginning on page 89, line 15, and continuing to line 5 on page 93.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is a "yea" vote a vote in favor of the adoption of the second part of the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the first branch of the amendment, beginning on page 89, line 15, and continuing to line 5 on page 93.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea," and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from

California and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Cuffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Smith
Burton	Lodge	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis

NAYS—12

Barbour	Gerry	Taft
Byrd	Hawkes	Walsh
Eastland	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wilson

NOT VOTING—16

Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Downey	Reed	Wagner
Gillette	Reynolds	White

So the first branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 93, after line 4, to insert:

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department or any corporation, institution or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in, the making of loans under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency R. I. and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended, or the making of loans or advances in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Food Production Financing Bulletins F-1 or F-2 of the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loan Branch.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from

Georgia to give an explanation as to why this section was stricken?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending amendment is found on page 95 of the bill. The section proposed to be stricken was a limitation imposed by the House, which would have the effect of eliminating and prohibiting any loans made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

This agency was established by an act of Congress which was passed in 1932. A great many loans were made by the agency in 1933 and 1934, particularly to farmers engaged in the production of cattle. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation then remained more or less dormant for a number of years. Some loans were made, notably in the Wenatchee Valley of Washington, the great apple-producing section, and those loans all turned out very successfully, so far as the evidence submitted to the committee showed. A number of other loans of types F-1 and F-2 were made to encourage the production of farm products.

There was a great deal of testimony before the committee as to the propriety of this organization using F-2 loans as an incentive for food production. They are in the nature of nonrecourse loans. They are made to persons who increase their acreage of certain war crops to a very marked degree, and the sole collateral for the loan is the crop which is produced.

Representations were made in behalf of those who were interested in having the work of the Regional Agricultural Corporation stopped altogether. Other farmers were most anxious that it be continued. Today I received a telegram from a group of farmers in the State of Florida, reading as follows:

Please use your influence to get the Senate to strike out section 2 of H. R. 2481 (agricultural appropriation bill) now before agricultural subcommittee of Senate Committee on Appropriations.

They were in error as to where the bill was, of course.

I continue reading from the telegram:

Said section abolishes the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The credit available under this program is the only means the undersigned have of producing crops on 3,000 acres this year and 10,000 acres next year. Private capital, Federal Land Bank, Production Credit Association, cannot provide the necessary production funds. Greatly prefer this type of assistance to subsidies. We are all members of the Farm Bureau Federation and disagree with its program in this respect.

That telegram is signed by 20 or 25 men whom I do not have the pleasure of knowing personally, but it shows the type of representations made to the committee in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, the committee was not unanimous in its approval of the type of loans being made under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. Despite the insinuations, however, that have been made against the committee, and the charges which have openly been made that we were undertaking to legislate all over the face of the earth, we did not feel this was a matter which should be determined on an appropriation bill. It was new matter in the bill,

not like the other legislative provisions we have offered, which have been in the act from year to year. It was new matter, and had the effect of repealing, by a limitation on appropriations, the favorable action of the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

So without regard to the views of the committee on this policy, the feeling in the committee was this is a question which should be handled by the standing committee. I believe reference was made to the fact that the Senator from Nebraska had introduced a bill which was pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and on which hearings were about to be had.

The Appropriations Committee clearly showed, in its discussion of this question, that it was almost the unanimous opinion of the committee that all the many ramifications of the various lending agencies of the Federal Government dealing with the farmers should be coordinated and reorganized. We are not a standing committee, and we do not undertake to violate the rules of the Senate by bringing in a legislative proposal which would have reorganized all the credit agencies. To protect the rights of the standing committees of the Senate we struck out the House provision, which we looked upon as an infringement upon the prerogatives of the standing committee which had the bill under consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his explanation.

I should like to see section 2 reinstated in the bill as it came from the House. I think it is a wise provision. All it would do would be to provide a limitation on the use of the funds appropriated in the bill we are now asked to pass.

In effect, it would say to the Department of Agriculture, "You may use these funds only for the specific purposes provided in the bill." Section 2, as it came from the House, provides that the Department may not use those funds through the back door for any other agency for which there is no appropriation in the bill.

There are other limitations in the pending bill with respect to which no question has been raised. Turn to the bottom of page 3. In the provision for salaries and expenses for the Department of Agriculture there is a limitation on the appropriation.

Turn to page 66 of the bill, on which we took so much time day before yesterday. Beginning with line 16 and continuing through to the heading on page 67, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," a limitation will be found which I think is more far-reaching than the limitation in the particular section now under discussion.

Turn to pages 70, 92, and 93. Further limitations will there be found in this bill by which we are asked to make appropriations of funds which shall be used for the purposes designated in the bill.

When we come to page 95, section 2, we are asked to delete that section because it is desired that the Regional

Agricultural Credit Corporation shall continue to function with the personnel of some of the other organizations for which we are appropriating in this bill.

Mr. President, I say that this is a wise provision. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation desires funds to administer the act, it should come to Congress and ask for an appropriation. That is its right and privilege. If it does not have the funds to administer the act, it should not take funds from any other agency. We should protect the Department of Agriculture.

We have been told by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that we are holding this budget down where it belongs. We have argued about expenses. He said the cut was made from \$54,000,000 to \$32,500,000 in one of the administrative provisions, I believe in connection with soil conservation. Then there was an argument on the floor, and a motion was made by the able Senator from Michigan, and we had a sort of auction, and agreed on \$30,000,000, cutting two and a half million from the appropriation for the administration of the act. Yet, we turn around and let the Department of Agriculture finance the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation by taking funds out of that Department and by subterfuge setting up personnel without coming to Congress and asking for an appropriation.

Mr. President, I say that this is a wise provision. It has been said that some point was raised in the House of Representatives as to whether or not it was new legislation. It is not new legislation. There is not an appropriation asked for here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say it was new legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator from Georgia to say in the latter part of his remarks that he felt that we should leave this to the legislative committees, that his was an appropriation committee, and that if the legislative committee wanted to take any legislative action, all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did make that statement, not on the ground that this is legislation, but that it had the effect of repealing legislation by a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the same thing indirectly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not made the point of order against it. I know that a point of order would not lie. Of course, it is a limitation on an appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order was raised in the House on the ground that this was new legislation.

Representative HOPE, of Kansas, wanted this section taken out of the bill, and on April 19, 1943, in a discussion of the matter on the floor of the House, he raised the point of order and made the following statement in support thereof. I want the Members of this body to note the ruling made by the Chair on this very point:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section just read on the

ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the gentleman to elaborate on his point of order and point out what part of the section is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOPE. This section has for its apparent purpose a prohibition of further loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. There is no provision in this bill making an appropriation for this Corporation. So the limitation on its face is against officials of the Department of Agriculture who might exercise supervisory functions over it and its activities.

The regional agricultural credit corporations were created in 1932 under the Hoover administration. There were originally 12 corporations, 1 in each Federal land bank district. Later legislation was passed which authorized the consolidation of the regional agricultural credit corporations and the return of capital not needed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be held as a revolving fund subject to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

In the meantime, and on March 27, 1933, an Executive order was issued which transferred the jurisdiction and control of the regional agricultural credit corporations from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under whose jurisdiction they had originally been set up, to the Farm Credit Administration, and in that order the functions which were transferred were defined as follows:

"The functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its board of directors relating to the appointment of officers and agents to manage regional agricultural credit corporations formed under section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932; relating to the establishment of rules and regulations for such management and relating to the approval of loans and advances made by such corporations and of the terms and conditions thereof."

Under that Executive order and under the law it is the duty and the function of the Farm Credit Administration to make rules and regulations to supervise the operations of the regional agricultural credit corporations and to approve loans made by them. I think it is generally recognized under the rules of the House that any language purporting to be a limitation which either imposes new duties upon a Government agency or prohibits it from performing the duties which have been assigned to it is not a limitation but is legislation.

In this particular case the Farm Credit Administration is prohibited, or rather its officers are prohibited, under the legislation from directing or authorizing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to make loans and perform the other functions that are imposed upon it by law. That being the case, it is apparent that the officials of the Farm Credit Administration will be unable to carry out their duties in supervising the operations of the Corporation, in approving loans, and other duties which have been assigned to them.

It can very readily be determined that this is legislation, I think, by considering the interpretation which officials of the Farm Credit Administration will place upon our action if the section remains in the bill. Certainly they would understand it to mean that Congress no longer expected them to carry on the functions which under the law they are to exercise over the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. In other words, they will conclude that Congress had changed its policy and has forbidden them to do what heretofore under the law they have been authorized and directed to do. That, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, very clearly constitutes legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to submit to the Chair the very purpose of the limitation is to prevent the expression of a certain task, function, or duty. It may never achieve that result, as a matter of fact, in substance, but that is its primary purpose. So I submit this is a very good limitation and quite within the rules and does not constitute legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order against section 2 which begins "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized to be expended shall be used," and so forth.

It is the view of the Chair this section is clearly a limitation, and if there are no funds provided in this section the limitation will be ineffective. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. President, this is not new legislation, it does not directly legislate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation out of the functions for which it was created. This is merely a limitation on the appropriation set up in the act, and if we are the guardians and custodians of public funds, we should see that no money is taken out of an appropriation for any of these departments and then by back-door methods meted out to some organization which does not come in and ask for the appropriation for its functions.

I say it is a wise provision, I say the provision in section 2 should be reinstated. It is the only proper way to legislate. Back-door methods are not in order, and they should not be employed here in the Senate. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation want funds, they know how to get them, they know how to administer the act, but for them to come in and take it away from the other departments on the theory we are giving those departments all the money they should have, simply means that they are allowed to borrow funds and personnel from the other departments and paying for the personnel out of these other appropriated funds.

We had Governor Black before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures. He said the only reason why he wanted to put this in was the fact that he could go ahead and lend this money through the triple A chairmen and there would be no additional personnel, that it would not cost any money, that they would merely borrow. He was asked, "Then, if that be true, can they do without the personnel in the other departments?" He said they had plenty of time, they could use them in both departments.

What was his testimony as to that? I have here a transcript of the evidence taken before the joint committee, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is the chairman, and the hearing was held on the resolution in which I asked that the R. A. C. C. be liquidated, that there no longer was an emergency, and that there was no need for it to function now. What was the testimony? I read now from the testimony of Governor Black:

Mr. BLACK. I do not know that one could name the most important. Manpower is of prime importance.

Senator WHERRY. Right on that question of manpower, let me ask you this: How could you make a greater saving on manpower than to combine all of your lending agencies into one and loan through that one lending agency, or to continue the production credit associations and the Farm Security Administration that are getting all the credit to the farmers which they need, rather than set up a new agency that will have a personnel that I imagine will be as great as either one of them?

Mr. BLACK. We are not using additional personnel, we are using existing personnel.

Senator WHERRY. What personnel are you using?

Mr. BLACK. We are using the personnel in the production credit associations, the national farm loan associations, certain numbers of Farm Security supervisors, in some cases Agricultural Adjustment Agency men.

Senator WHERRY. You mean that then the Agricultural Adjustment Agency will handle these loans?

Mr. BLACK. In some cases the Agricultural Adjustment Agency men. Ordinarily the man who has been handling the Commodity Credit loans would be the local representative.

Senator WHERRY. You would have to increase the personnel to make these loans, would you not, even in their own organization?

Mr. BLACK. No, sir.

Senator WHERRY. Will it not work out that way?

Mr. BLACK. I should not think so.

Senator WHERRY. If you want to loan \$225,000,000, you can still do it on the set-up they have in my county?

Mr. BLACK. It is my understanding the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation is not planning to put on any personnel. They will reimburse the agencies for the service on a time-and-cost basis.

The CHAIRMAN. Reimburse other agencies on what kind of a basis?

Mr. BLACK. A time study and cost basis.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you will borrow personnel from other agencies?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. They would be reimbursed by Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation for the time spent.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, will not the other agencies have to get new employees to take the place of the ones you borrow?

Mr. BLACK. It is not contemplated that they will.

The CHAIRMAN. They have too many now, then, haven't they?

Mr. BLACK. I do not know that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If they came to your agency, the number of employees you would require, either they have had too many or they have got to get other employees to replace those that they loan to you.

Mr. BLACK. There is always a certain amount of additional work that can be taken on in any agency.

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you expect to borrow from other agencies?

Mr. BLACK. Well, the services necessary for servicing these loans would require the services of one man in each county.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 3,000 counties.

Mr. BLACK. Approximately.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider then that there would be 3,000 employees that you would need?

Mr. BLACK. Well, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation will not have any direct employees.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not my question.

You said you are borrowing these men and you are paying the other agencies for them.

Mr. BLACK. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Government is concerned, they are just as much employees as if you paid them as your employees directly.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. * * *

Yes; and there are 3,000 chairmen in the different counties and in addition to the 3,000 chairmen there would be the stenographic help that would necessarily have to be set up under the R. A. C. C.

So there are not only the 3,000 chairmen being paid for out of the funds which are appropriated in this bill, but, in addition, there will be the clerical help they will have to borrow and pay for, getting it from some other department, if they are to maintain and service the loans which they expect to make under the R. A. C. C.

This is a protective measure. If they have more personnel in the department than they need, we should not appropriate for unnecessary employees. If they have too many in the department, this is a good place to begin to cut the appropriations, rather than raise them at every turn of the road.

It is contended that the R. A. C. C. cannot function unless they get the personnel from the Department of Agriculture. I do not think that is true. That is the opinion of Governor Black, but Governor Black contradicted himself so many times when he was put on the stand that it is hard to tell exactly what Governor Black did think back in March, before he had time, apparently, to come before the committee and review and revise his testimony.

If Senators read the original act, in the back of the Byrd report—and it can be secured right here in the Senate Chamber—they will find in the original act provision that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation be set up under the R. F. C., it is responsible to the R. F. C. and the R. F. C. has granted it, under this act, the authority to appoint its supervisors, and those supervisors can do anything provided in the act. Then the act provides:

All expenses incurred in connection with the operation of the Corporation shall be supervised and paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under such rules and regulations as its Board of Directors may prescribe.

In other words, under the original act the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation can continue to function, under its own provisions, without borrowing personnel from different departments. That takes care of the situation in Washington where the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, which was an emergency organization set-up, can continue to make loans out of the funds it already has, supervised by the Farm Credit under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It does not have to make any accounting to the Secretary of Agriculture. That is provided in the act itself. That was the holding when they said this was not new legislation, that this was simply a limitation on the appropriations in this act.

What is the R. A. C. C.? The original set-up made it a relief organization, the old barnyard-loan organization. I was one who helped to put it over out in Nebraska. Incidentally, I was one of the first directors of the F. S. A. in my county, and I helped to organize the first production-credit corporation in the district. I have had practical experience with these organizations. I

did not learn about them from a book. I know what their purposes are. I know what they were created for, and I know what they have been doing in the different communities in my own State.

The R. A. C. C. did a wonderful piece of work. It was organized to help in drought conditions. It was organized to help men get money in an emergency, when they could not get it from private sources, when there were no private banks to which to go; and it did a good job. During all that time it succeeded well. It was managed by credit men of experience, men who knew how to make a loan, and they made the loans, and did a good job.

I should be perfectly willing to keep that organization intact, as it is intact, and make these emergency loans as they are being made in Washington. Whenever there was an emergency, I would be perfectly willing to let them do it. But the R. A. C. C. became dormant in 1934. There came many other credit agencies after 1934, after the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation had served its purpose. Then came the Credit Production Corporation, then came the Federal Farm Security Act, and there are organizations that served their States and took over the functions of the R. A. C. C. The R. A. C. C. is unnecessary except as an emergency organization, and the department should only use it in that way.

What were the conclusions of the Byrd committee as to the R. A. C. C. being revamped to serve the purpose for which Governor Black said it would be used?

What is the first conclusion the Byrd committee reached?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall take 15 minutes on the bill.

1. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program was created during the emergency of 1932 and 1933 in order to extend credit to farmers in the midst of a national drought. This particular credit emergency no longer exists.

That is the first conclusion the committee reached after all the testimony which had been taken, and the transcript of that testimony will fill a volume of tremendous size. The committee heard from farmers all over the United States. It heard from bankers over the United States. It heard from the departmental heads in Washington. Some of the testimony given before the committee I expect to place in the RECORD.

The committee said there is no emergency existing; therefore it is unnecessary to set up another bureau here in Washington. It is unnecessary at this time to bring in another agency and man it with 6,000 persons.

From the testimony let us see how badly we need this organization for food. I am not acquainted with a man named Mr. O'Neal. He did not testify before the Byrd committee, but he did testify before the Senate Appropriations Committee. On page 735, at the top of the page, will be found what Mr. O'Neal said with respect to the R. A. C. C.:

Mr. O'NEAL. In the early days, we thought there might be an occasion, as Senator BANK-

HEAD brought out, where you use that type of loan. But now we feel this way about it: We don't want to reestablish or revive an agency that will jeopardize the sound financing of agriculture. We don't want that. In other words, if that is used rightly, on a sound basis, it can do a lot of good, as it has done in emergencies.

Those are the words of Mr. O'Neal.

What does Mr. Patton say about the matter? On page 888 will be found testimony by Mr. Talbott. He was being examined by members of this committee. Mr. Talbott quoted what Mr. Patton said. I am not acquainted with Mr. Patton, but this is what Mr. Patton said:

As Mr. Patton stated, we urge expansion of the Farm Security Administration, and we should like to have complete war crop insurance. I believe there is already a bill up here on the Hill, before some other committee, to get a type of war crop insurance where the Government takes all of the natural risks. If we could get those two aids, we would not be particularly concerned about nonrecourse loans or Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

The provision with respect to the Farm Security Administration has been kept in the bill, and appropriation has been made for it. Since that has been done, we do not need R. A. C. C., according to Mr. Patton.

What does Mr. Goss, of the Grange, say? I read from page 899 of the same hearings:

Generally speaking, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation should be continued in liquidation because cooperative credit and private credit are now available to supply most of the needs for which they were originally created. We would favor continuing a regional credit corporation fund for meeting emergencies, but we wish to point out that under the existing acts, the corporations are given the broadest possible powers of lending, the sole restriction being that the loans be made for agricultural purposes. Even the expenses of operation are paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

That, Mr. President, ought to dispel any fear in the mind of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] that the R. A. C. C. could be maintained regardless of whether section 2 is put back in the act or not. The testimony of Mr. Goss is that the expenses of that Corporation are being paid, when making these emergency loans, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. Goss continues:

They were set up simply as emergency agencies, and the emergency for which they were created has passed.

Here we have the testimony of the heads of three farm organizations, and they go on record as saying that the emergency has passed, and that we do not need R. A. C. C.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 15 minutes. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator when I am through. I hope the Senator will not consider me to be discourteous, but I wish to finish my statement if I may.

I now read conclusion No. 2 of the Byrd committee:

The revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program duplicates

wholly, or partially, the lending activities of 19 other Federal agricultural lending agencies performing identically similar or related functions.

I wish Senators would bear this in mind. When passing appropriation measures for any one of these organizations please bear in mind that many others are duplicating the work of the particular agency for which appropriation is made. I wish to read the list of agricultural lending agencies which are performing identically similar or related functions. How many Senators know how many there are? There are 20 of them. They are as follows: The Central Bank for Cooperatives, Commodity Credit Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, District Banks for Cooperatives, Electric Home and Farm Authority, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, Farm Credit Administration, Farm Security Administration, Federal credit unions, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal land banks, Land Bank Commissioner loans; national farm-loan associations, production credit associations, production credit corporations, Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, regional agricultural credit corporations, and Rural Electrification Administration.

So, Mr. President, we have 20 organizations lending money to farmers on short- and long-time credit loans. I say that if nothing more comes out of today's discussion than this, that we enact legislation whereby we can streamline all these agencies into one and cut out the administrative costs of 19 of them and have one Government agency under one administration, with one set of personnel, take care of these loans, then the afternoon will have been well spent. But with the thousands of personnel these 20 organizations already have, to attempt to set up another organization and provide 6,000 persons for it is a waste of money. It is time to consider the matter of waste of money rather than the spending of money like drunken sailors, as has been done in connection with some of the appropriations which have been made.

Mr. President, what does the head of the Federal Reserve System say about this matter? I wish to read a letter from Mr. Eccles. I wish to thank the gracious Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] for sending me a copy of this letter. It is as follows:

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and
Currency, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: This is in reply to your letter of March 31 in which you ask for an opinion as to the merits of S. 914, which provides for the dissolution of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

That is a bill I introduced to terminate the R. A. C. C. Hearings were held on it before the Byrd committee, as I said, in February of this year. The bill provides for the dissolution of the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I continue to read from the letter:

I favor this bill because I believe that such agricultural production for war as is not now

adequately financed through regular banking channels or through the production credit associations can best be provided for by insurance of war crops.

Remember, Senators, this is Mr. Eccles writing to the Senator from New York.

I favor enactment of H. R. 2029, which has the endorsement of the Secretary of Agriculture, or of some similar measure, authorizing the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to insure such war crops as the Secretary may designate. This will enable—

And, Members of the Senate, notice this particularly please—

This will enable private credit to flow directly from the banks to the insured borrowers and will avoid the difficulties, particularly the competition, which result from direct Government lending when there is, as now, an abundance of credit available to the private banking system.

I wish to say to the Senate that this very day there is in the banks of the United States of America \$88,000,000,000, nearly four times as much money as was in the banks in 1932, when the R. A. C. C. set-up was initiated.

Private lending agencies are looking for loans. They will take loans wherever they can find them. Mr. Eccles says in his letter that if we can provide for a credit-risk insurance arrangement extending down through the private direct-lending agencies—an arrangement such as those we have provided for under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation or under the insurance risk arrangements, we shall be able to utilize the private lending agencies of the country to do the very thing for which 6,000 persons, I think, will be required in order to finance and administer the R. A. C. C.; and that will eliminate the competition with the private lending agencies.

I read further from Mr. Eccles' letter:

As a matter of general principle, I am for Government measures which have the effect of facilitating the flow of private credit into production, whether in the field of agriculture or other necessary private business activity, and against measures that tend to supplant or compete unnecessarily with private enterprise. To the extent that the need may exist for Government aid to stimulate additional agricultural production, I am satisfied that this general principle and the war effort itself will be best served by reliance either upon insurance of war crops or upon some similar form of guaranteeing the producer against loss rather than upon establishment of competitive Government lending agencies in a field already well served by the numerous banks in the agricultural regions throughout the Nation, as well as by the production credit associations.

The foregoing expresses the opinion of the Board of Governors as well as my own.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES, Chairman.

What more authority does the Senate want than that word coming directly from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System? The heads of the Federal Reserve System desire to do the very thing I advocate. Yet, under the provisions of the bill, if we strike out section 2, we let the Secretary of Agriculture bring out a new agency to expand the loans to \$250,000,000, and they will be

able to pyramid that amount to \$500,000,000. Then the agency will be established, and will come back to Congress and request a larger appropriation; and we shall have a new bureau to finance. In my experience in the 5½ months I have served as a Member of the Senate I have found that it is very difficult to eliminate a bureau once it is established. The time to eliminate the bureau is before it commences operations and we now have a wonderful opportunity to perform that major operation.

Let me tell the Senate that I have received letter after letter from Production Credit Administration members and from F. S. A. members stating that they can lend the money just as profitably or even more profitably than can the R. A. C. C. Yet Mr. Black says they do not have the authority. In 5 minutes he could get all the authority he wanted. I think he has just as much authority to loan through these agencies as he has to take money from the Department of Agriculture and use it for the R. A. C. C. Where does he get his authority to do that? What right does he have to take the money? He has no more right to do that than he has to loan the money through any other agency. If he has a right to loan it through one agency he has an equal right to loan it through another agency.

What was the further finding of the committee? I read conclusion 3 of the Byrd committee's findings:

3. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program, by soliciting credit where the field is drastically limited, is depriving private lending institutions and country banks of their normal loan business.

That is their finding after considering all the evidence.

Their next finding is as follows:

4. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program may weaken the structure of over 11,000 country banks, which are carrying a great burden of the food-for-freedom program, and the direction of and collections from War bond sales in their respective communities throughout the United States.

That is the impartial opinion of the committee. On the committee sat the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NVEL], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was the only one who sat through those hearings and who did not join in the report. That is their opinion, that is their finding, that is their judgment. I say such report should be seriously considered and followed by the Senate of the United States.

Oh, yes; I will probably be accused of carrying a portfolio for the private banks of the country; but let me say my word. This country was built upon private enterprise—the corner grocery store, the farmer and the merchant who went out and pioneered this country. They are the ones who built this great Nation. All of them obtained their finances from the country bankers. They are the people who developed this great Republic

of ours; they are the people who developed our great enterprises and institutions—the great American way of life for which we are fighting, and which we must continue. However, if we continue to socialize the credit of this country we shall have communism and we shall lose the very things our boys are fighting for. That will certainly come to pass, just as the senior Senator from Wisconsin said a few minutes ago.

I will fight to the last ditch for private enterprise. I will do all I can to eliminate governmental subsidized competition with private enterprise. I will oppose the establishment of unnecessary bureaus every time I get an opportunity to do so. I will do my part to see that the R. A. C. C. is not established. We do not need it. It is just another unnecessary agency with an added 6,000 personnel which could better be used in the war effort.

Some Senators are smiling. They may not smile 2 years from now. I say to the Senate that I have been out in the country, and I know what conditions are and what the people are thinking. I come from the sticks. I come from the country, and I know what the people there are thinking. Some one of these days Senators are going to wake up and find that we are spending \$200,000,000 a day. Some of these days they are going to find that they have mortgaged more than the assessed value of the country. Some one of these days they are going to find that they cannot even start to pay the principal of the indebtedness and that they will not be able to pay even the interest on the great debt that has been created. I am fighting to preserve the financial stability of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not speaking on the bill now. I should like to inquire whether it is the purpose to continue longer today. It is already 7 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the Senate first convened this morning the distinguished minority leader expressed the hope that the Senate might pass the bill today; and the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, the junior Senator from Georgia, stated that he would do everything he could to have the bill passed today, and gave notice to the Senate that he would hope to have the Senate continue in session until consideration of the bill had been concluded.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. I also understand that there is a limitation on debate; and there is no reason to keep the Senate in session very long tonight. I desire to be heard on this amendment. If the committee insists on keeping the amendment in the bill—an amendment which has absolutely no excuse whatsoever for being in the bill—I am going to be heard as long as I can be; and there will be other motions coming on tonight—for instance, a motion to suspend the rule; and I do not understand that there is any limitation of debate on such a motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that two motions to suspend the rule are in prospect. We shall not be able to finish at any early hour tonight. I am at a loss to know why the Committee on Appropriations struck out the amendment if only the R. A. C. C. is involved. I desire to be heard on that matter; because it is one action on the part of the committee for which there cannot possibly be any justification.

I now make an appeal that the Senate recess until tomorrow morning. It will be perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senate recess until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock tomorrow. Certainly, we can finish consideration of the bill tomorrow if we recess now until the morning.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from Georgia. Frankly, I would have objected to the unanimous-consent request if I had been in the Chamber at the time when it was submitted. I desire to be heard for at least half an hour on the question of the school-lunch program, and my remarks would naturally require some debate by other Members of the Senate. It seems to me there is no such rush that we should be required to remain in session until midnight tonight.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Georgia has said. The Senate has worked very diligently on the bill. If it had been possible to conclude its consideration tonight, it would be perfectly satisfactory to have the Senate do so; but the Senator from Alabama has given notice of a very important motion to suspend the rule. To his motion the agreement for limitation of debate does not apply, in my opinion; and I listened to the agreement very carefully when it was proposed.

I desire to give notice now that if the Senate is to remain in session tonight until the bill is passed, if that motion is made, the bill will be passed, very, very late tonight.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to have expression made on the matter by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say that I am not at all impressed by the threats that we shall have debate; because I should not want to limit the opportunity of any Member of the Senate to debate the provisions of the bill. I have no disposition whatever to keep the Senate in session until an unduly late hour. However, the suggestion that the bill be passed today came from the distinguished leader of the minority, and was heartily concurred in by the acting majority leader, and I wholly approved of it.

The pending bill comes to us very late this year, as I have stated a number of times. We shall have to work day and night in conference in order to canvass all the items with the House. I do not know that at the very best we shall be able to place the bill in the hands of the President by the end of the present fiscal year. I do not want to be put in the position of making any threats or of

attempting to prevent the making of speeches. I enjoy hearing my colleagues speak. However, if the minority leader and the acting majority leader wish to have the Senate recess until tomorrow I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what would the Senator think about a suggestion that the Senate take a recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we are to recess now I think we should meet in the morning. I should like to know the views of the minority leader.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I must defer, out of practice and courtesy, to the attitude of the Senator in charge of the bill. This morning I expressed the very strong hope that we could stay here and finish consideration of the bill tonight. There are 118 amendments involved. The bill must be approved by the 30th of June. I am anxious, as I think we all are, to get through with the appropriation bills, because we may be able to work out a summer recess. I think most of the Members of the Senate are willing to stay in session longer today; I think we should do so. At least I think we should dispose of this amendment. That is my view. However, I shall yield to the view of the Senator in charge of the bill. I have briefly expressed my view. I think the Senator in charge of the bill should decide for himself what he wishes to do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course I will subordinate my judgment in the matter to the views of the Senator in charge of the bill. I think this ought to be said, however: Frankly, from conversations which I have had with certain Members, and an expression of views, I doubt whether we could make any progress tonight, in view of the feeling of a great many Members. It being very doubtful whether we could make any progress tonight, I am inclined to think—although, as I say, I subordinate my views to those of the Senator in charge of the bill—that we might as well take a recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow. I shall be guided by the views of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who has the floor? Has the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] yielded the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I claim the floor in my own right for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Buck	Danaher
Austin	Burton	Davis
Bailey	Bushfield	Eastland
Ball	Byrd	Ellender
Bankhead	Capper	Ferguson
Barbour	Caraway	George
Bilbo	Chandler	Gerry
Bone	Chavez	Gillette
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Green
Bridges	Connally	Guffey

Gurney	Mead	Stewart
Hatch	Millikin	Taft
Hawkes	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Murray	Tobey
Holman	Nye	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Langer	Overton	Wallgren
Lodge	Pepper	Walsh
Lucas	Radcliffe	Wheeler
McCarran	Revercomb	Wherry
McClellan	Reynolds	Wiley
McFarland	Russell	Willis
McKellar	Scrugham	Wilson
McNary	Shipstead	
Maybank	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bilbo in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—14		
Bailey	Connally	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Ellender	Scrugham
Bone	George	Smith
Byrd	Gerry	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	

NAYS—62

Alken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barbour	Holman	Reynolds
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Cuffey	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Nye	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	Butler	Gillette
Brooks	Clark, Idaho	Glass
	Downey	Johnson, Calif.

Kilgore	Robertson	Wagner
McClellan	Thomas, Idaho	White
Maloney	Truman	Willis
Reed	Tydings	

So the Senate refused to take a recess. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was rejected. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Cuffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is my frank opinion that the mood of the Senate at this time is such that it is not best to try to legislate. I think the wisest thing to do would be to recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. I am confident that we may finish the pending bill if we now recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for the purpose of making a motion?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was rejected. Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the

floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have yielded to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, allow me to assure the Senator from South Carolina that I want the floor in my own right, and that I wish to say something about the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has yielded. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. BONE. I do not desire to quiz my brother.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Washington advise me why he wishes me to yield?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the Senator from Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am happy to observe that all has suddenly become sweetness and light, and I hope I shall pierce the gloom surrounding my colleagues like a gleam of celestial sunshine in what I am about to say.

Mr. President, I was mightily moved by the observations of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I tried in my own way to follow him, because I am an earnest seeker after the truth, and I would not have missed any of the gems of wisdom from the Senator from Nebraska.

I was more than interested in the statement of the Senator about rugged individualism, and I recall—and if I am in error I hope some Senator will correct me—that the R. A. C. C. provision was enacted in 1932, in the era of rugged individualism. It had become so rugged that it was kicking the tail feathers off the very businessmen for whom the Senator from Nebraska now speaks, and they were going broke in my section of the country at a rate which was astounding, to say the least. It was the end of the era of rugged individualism which the Senator so staunchly defends here this afternoon, and if any of the rugged individualism had continued very much longer, there would not have been even a capitalist system left in the United States.

The law was put on the statute books, not by new dealers, but by the Hoover administration, which makes it very interesting to find a good, stanch Republican assailing it today as something which might lead to something very bad, perhaps to communism.

It so happens that the R. A. C. C. today, and for some years past, has only been operating in a couple of sections of the country, around Minneapolis, and in my own State in what is known as the Wenatchee section, which is one of the great apple-growing sections of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. It is only second to the southern section of New Hampshire, if I am correct.

Mr. BONE. I should be heartbroken if New Hampshire got into the picture as an apple-producing State. I know it has

produced many fine things, but I did not know it was much of an apple-producing State.

Mr. President, in the gloomy days of the depression the bankers the Senator from Nebraska talks about let the apple producers in my State down with a dull thud, and in 1938, in one of the greatest crises that has ever stricken any section of the country, those apple growers were going to hell in a hand basket financially, and losing their homes, and when the bankers would not come to their help, I, with my colleague in the Senate and my friends in the House, utilized every agency of this Government to keep them alive, and today they are barely prosperous, but they still need the assistance which the R. A. C. C. has given them.

The Senator from Nebraska has conjured up a Frankenstein monster, some great gargantuan thing to affright us, but he has made a mountain out of a mole hill. Last year R. A. C. C. loaned the apple growers of Washington—and they are the salt of the earth—\$8,000,000, and it has all been paid back. What is wrong with that program? In God's name, what is wrong with it?

The Senator says there is no crisis. In the name of all that is reasonable, what are we facing today? No nation in all the endless cycles of time ever faced anything half so grave as this crisis, and all Senators know it.

What do you call this kind of a war, which shakes the very foundations of western civilization? Do you not call it a crisis? Yet the Senator wants to bury or cremate this law, drive it off the statute books, put it out of business, although as I understand from his statement, he implies that it will not put the R. A. C. C. out of business. The provision is:

That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of anybody engaged in making loans.

What would be the effect of that provision? I do not think there is a lawyer in this body with nerve enough to rise and say that it would not effect the death of the thing. If the advice of my friend from Nebraska is followed, we decree the death of R. A. C. C., and make no mistake about it. Let us be frank about it. It would simply blot it out. He quoted my friend Bert Goss, of the Grange. I understand the Senator from Nebraska is not a lawyer.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am a lawyer, and I say that the adoption of section 2 would have nothing to do with whether or not R. A. C. C. would continue to function.

Mr. BONE. I listened to the Senator very intently, and tried to follow him, and I do not find myself in agreement with him.

He quoted Mr. Albert Goss, of the Grange. I suggest that he did what lawyers frequently do—that is, quote a part of the testimony. Mr. Goss was asked whether it would not be better to abolish R. A. C. C., and to that question he answered:

We doubt if this is the most constructive solution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Washington, because I know his time is limited, but let me state the situation. The R. A. C. C. matter came before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I looked into it, and I shall take occasion later to say why I looked into it with care. This provision does not abolish the R. A. C. C., it is still in existence, and it can be revived whenever there is any necessity for it.

Mr. BONE. I understand that the provision does not abolish it, just by blotting it out, but it says that no part of the appropriation in this bill can be used to pay anybody connected with making loans under it.

Mr. GEORGE. Why should it be?

Mr. BONE. Somebody has to process these loans.

Mr. GEORGE. Has not the R. A. C. C. money?

Mr. BONE. Yes; but it has to hire someone to do the work in making the loans.

Mr. GEORGE. That is just the point, they have not the gall to hire 3,000 or 5,000 men at a time when there is no emergency and no occasion to use the R. A. C. C. That is all there is to it. They want to borrow the personnel from other agencies of the Government. I am assuring the Senator of that now, because there is no one trying to abolish it. It will not be abolished. It can still be revived whenever there is an occasion for it to make any loans. In my opinion an appropriation of money to pay people to do something cannot be justified where those who have the funds in hand are not willing to face the criticism of the country and pay the money out of their own funds.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, much as I admire my able colleague from Georgia, I cannot bring myself to agree with his conclusion that there is no great emergency, no crisis. I perhaps go as far as any Member of the Senate in believing that this country faces a supreme crisis in the production of food, and anything we can do today to stimulate the production of food—and certainly the R. A. C. C. has achieved it in my State—is something well worth doing.

I wish to go back for an instant, because I mentioned the matter only in passing. In the year 1938 the banking groups in my State were not making loans to the apple farmers—and the apple business is a vitally important business in my State—but were very bitter and very critical of the Federal Government for stepping into the picture and extending credit to the farmers in the apple business. So a warm friend of mine who was present at a certain meeting said, "The bankers do not like this program of Federal credit." Then he said, "I will have my friend HOMER BONE wire the Government in Washington and ask the Federal Government to step out of this credit picture and turn over the whole function of lending to these farmers to private banking interests, and I will send that telegram to-

night, put it right on the wires and send it to Washington." When he put that up, cold turkey, what do you think the bankers out there did? They did precisely as my colleagues suspect; they said, "Oh, no; let the Government continue this loaning activity."

Mr. President, the apple growers are getting into better shape. They are creating a credit of their own which will soon amount to one-half million dollars.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BONE. I do not have very much time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall take but a moment.

Mr. BONE. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish the RECORD to show that there was no yea-and-nay vote had on the committee amendment providing for the purchase of land for farm tenants, which appears on page 93 of the bill, beginning in line 6. I wish the RECORD to show that I voted for the appropriation for the purchase of farm lands by worthy individual tenants to make them home owners, as provided in the bill, with the safeguards against collectivism as provided therein.

Mr. BONE. Let me say this, Mr. President, and I say it because I am attempting on this floor to defend some very decent people, because I do not want to see them crucified even to satisfy the tempestuous feelings of my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that a group of farmers who will borrow \$8,000,000 and pay it back almost within a year are a darned good credit risk. That certainly does not represent communism.

When my friend the Senator from Nebraska read off the list of Government agencies I did not know whether he was starting to read a list of the members of the New York Stock Exchange or not. We have 10,000 private enterprises all levying tribute upon agriculture. But the farmers in the Wenatchee Valley are not parasitical fungus growths on the body social. They are raising a fund by taking 2 cents a box on each box of apples sold. They have nearly one-half million dollars in that fund. The businessmen there are putting approximately \$35,000 into the fund. In a little while they will have nearly \$1,000,000 in cold cash to sweeten the pot, and then the Federal Government can step out of the picture. But is the Senate going to decree the death of this program in the Wenatchee Valley simply because my friend the Senator from Nebraska does not like it?

I will say to the Senate that there is some degree of responsibility here, and I repeat what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said earlier today, that if Senators wish to create bitterness in the country let them go right ahead with the program of cutting off the little fellows. We might as well be perfectly frank and not kid ourselves, Senators, as we go toddling down this pathway of legislation, for we are headed into some tempests—make no mistake about it.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what is going on. There is a great emotional and intellectual

ferment in this country, but God help us if we ever pull the props out from under the average little fellow. If he has any guts, he will never take it again. If he is a real American, he will not go through what he went through under the Hoover administration. If he is true to the traditions of his grandsires, he will not go hungry or allow his family to go hungry in a nation whose potentialities for production are what ours happen to be at this time. We must protect the home front here while the war is going on.

Mr. President, this Chamber has resounded day after day with messages about the grim necessity of producing more food for America. We must feed our people here at home or else have a panic. Anything that will stimulate, that will help the producers of food, is much to be desired. We are not giving these people charity.

What do Senators think this is? Does my friend the Senator from Nebraska think this is charity, that he would fling charity to these people like he would fling a bone to a hungry dog? It is a strongly Republican district that my friend the Senator from Nebraska is talking about, and I am glad he raised the issue on this floor. I hate to mention any aspect of partisanship, but the cold record now stands, and if the agency under consideration is destroyed, it will have been destroyed at the insistence of a good conservative Republican, and let that be a matter of record.

I do not like to emphasize these things, Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Washington on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BONE. I will take a little more time on the bill.

Mr. President, there is too much of the record to go through to justify me in attempting to review the whole history of the R. A. C. C. What is there about it that invites all this wrath? The agency existed for only a couple of years, and then in 1934 it subsided. Why was it revived, and how, in the last 2 or 3 years? It was revived when we got into the war. It was revived because there was a fear in the hearts of the men who were motivating this program that we would need to give more assistance to the producers.

When objection is made to the number of lending agencies which exists it reminds me of a person who objects to the number of banks which exist in a town. He might say, "Why in the dickens can we not have simply 1 bank instead of having 4 or 5 in this town?" If any one were to suggest such a thing he would immediately hear a defense of sturdy individualism, rugged individualism, and rugged business in America. Those who would make the defense would say that anyone has a right to go into the lending business, and that we can have 1 bank or 50 banks in a town if we wish. But, Mr. President, if we happen to have more than 1 organization in our governmental set-up which happen to render assistance to agriculture, and the organizations are divided

into regional divisions, we find men crying against them and inveighing against them.

Mr. President, I do not like the idea of so many agencies. I should like to see many of them brought together. But this is not the time to destroy an agency which is functioning in only two sections of the country. The record does not show, and my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, did not point out, that the Government was losing any money by reason of these loans.

The banks of the Wenatchee Valley section of my State have telegraphed me and urged me, HOMER BONE, to stand on the floor of the Senate and defend the R. A. C. C. program in my State, and in order that I might accomplish that purpose I have prepared an amendment, in case the Senate, by what I would call improvident action, should reject the amendment prepared by the Appropriations Committee, and refuse to accept its dictum.

Mr. President, that is all I want to say on the subject. Other Senators wish to speak on it. But I say to the Senate that Senators cannot predicate their vote or their attitude of mind on a theory that we do not confront a crisis in food production. Senators on both sides of the aisle have stood up in this Chamber and said we will confront a crisis in food. Men are saying the same thing on the radio all the time. Senators will take upon their souls a considerable responsibility if they vote now to cripple or destroy any agency whose expenditures, contrasted with war expenditures—

Are as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine.

They amount to nothing then. Literally they are the cube root of nothing.

Mr. President, I looked at one report today with respect to the number of persons employed in the Government. I think it was put out in connection with the McKellar bill. Of the 1,300,000 employees, 703,000 are in the Army and the Navy. That reduces tremendously the total number of employees. Probably 55 percent of all the employees engaged in the service of war and the making of war have nothing to do with normal governmental operations. They have nothing to do with any of our fiscal operations. Fifty-five percent of them are engaged in the grim business of war, which means the shedding of blood for the protection of the country. We have this food job confronting us at home, and if we let the food production of the country break down, if we permit ourselves the luxury of assailing some food-producing instrumentality by weakening its power to preserve itself, we shall have to answer, not only to the country, but to our own consciences.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall renew my request, since it is manifest that consideration of the bill cannot be concluded at any reasonable hour tonight, that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock. I state very frankly that I wish to discuss the pending amendment. It is especially important to the Democratic Party; because if the Democratic Party is going to commit itself to legislation of this kind

at a time when the banks of the country are literally bursting with money, the Democratic Party will have a very poor record with which to go before the country in 1944; and I do not want to see that done.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am asking that the further consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow morning—a request I never would have suggested, and would not urge now, if it were not apparent that we cannot reach an end to the consideration of the bill at an early hour.

I conferred with the Senator from Alabama, and he assured me that he was going to offer his amendment which would involve a motion to suspend the rule. In that event, we would get into the field of unlimited debate again, and I know we would not be able to reach a final vote on the bill until very, very late tonight.

Therefore, desiring to discuss the amendment briefly, I asked that the matter go over until tomorrow morning.

I now renew my request that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I should be perfectly agreeable to having a recess taken until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me state again that I should yield to the wishes of the able Senator from Georgia, the Senator in charge of the bill. If I felt that by meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning we could have some reasonable assurance that we would conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow, I should not object to the request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding hearings on the bill providing for extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities, and also is holding hearings on the question of subsidy payments in working out a roll-back arrangement. At the request of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, we have arranged for a meeting tomorrow, and have agreed to hear him at 10:30 a. m. Of course, the next day is Saturday. If we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow—and I believe we shall be, with the limitation of debate—I should like very much to be able to comply with both obligations: To be in the committee meeting, and also to be present at the session of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to go through with the program. I have always endeavored to be reasonable and to yield to the wishes of the Senator in charge of a bill. If the agreement we made earlier in the day would include limitation of debate on motions, as well as limitation of debate on the bill and on amendments thereto, I think it would be agreeable to have the Senate recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we can have an understanding as to limitation on motions which might be made on the bill, as well as on amendments and on the bill itself, I think we might make more progress by recessing at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, those of us on this side of the Chamber are very much interested in what is going on. We are not able to hear. Will the Senator please repeat his statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall endeavor to lift my voice; I was not aware that I was talking in a lower tone than usual. I should be glad to stay here tonight if I thought there was any possibility of concluding consideration of the bill tonight. I do not like to tire Senators. If we can obtain an agreement about limitation throughout, I think we might as well recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock. A number of Members of the Senate do not want to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. Unless some unforeseen developments occur, we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow; and if its consideration is concluded tomorrow, the time at which the conclusion of its consideration is reached will not make a great deal of difference.

However, I wish to say that if tomorrow there develops some unforeseen situation which would carry us into the late hours of the afternoon, I shall insist that the Senate remain in session until consideration of the bill is concluded. The time in which the bill must be enacted into law is growing very short. In previous years we have been in conference on agricultural appropriation bills for as long as 2 months without being able to reach an agreement on all the matters at variance between the two Houses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation to apply to all motions as well as to all amendments and to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I did not understand the request.

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked unanimous consent that the limitation on debate be construed to apply to all motions as well as to the bill and to amendments thereto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would mean 15 minutes and 15 minutes, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. In that event, no Senator could speak more than once, or for more than 15 minutes, on the bill or on any amendment or motion, with the understanding that the total time allotted to any one Senator would not be more than 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Chair state what we are now asked to consent to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has requested unanimous consent that the 15-minute limitation be extended to all motions affecting the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are we asked to act now on the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Georgia has not made such a motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the announcement made at the beginning of the session today by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama included only a limitation of debate to 15 minutes on the amendments. A moment ago I suggested—and request is now being made—that motions be included in that agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has just agreed to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McNARY. I did not so understand. A question was asked. Has the Senate agreed to the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No objection was made.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope that suggestion will be followed. I wonder if we could not include in the agreement with reference to the time of convening tomorrow an agreement as to the time for taking the final vote on the bill—for instance, to have the final vote on the bill taken at 5 o'clock or 5:30. If that were agreed to, we should have arranged for the whole program.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in order to comply with the Senator's suggestion, it would be necessary to have a quorum call tonight. A quorum call would not be required in connection with voting on a motion or on an amendment; but if action is to be taken on final passage of the bill, a quorum call would be required tonight. I, myself, can see no objection to having the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest that the hour of meeting be made 11:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. McNARY. No; 11 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a number of Senators are affected by this matter. Now that we have a limitation as to the length of debate, I think it will be possible to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow. My suggestion is that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I was expressing the hope that it would be agreeable to the Senate to recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. That would be agreeable to me. With the limitation on debate, I think it would be possible to have the Senate conclude consideration of the bill if it convened at 12 o'clock tomorrow. A number of Senators who are interested in the pending matter have expressed the hope that the hour of meeting tomorrow would be 12 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. I shall defer most reluctantly. I do not see why one committee which is to meet in order to hear Mr. Green or anyone else should determine the course of action which the Senate should take.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say that more considerations are involved in my suggestion than the one referred to by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I think the matter should be left as suggested. I shall object to having the Senate meet at 12 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me ask what is the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless something unforeseen develops, I think it will be possible for the Senate to conclude consideration of the bill by meeting at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I offer a substitute motion that the time of meeting on tomorrow be 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has moved that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. The Senator from New Hampshire has made a substitute motion that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the objection to meeting at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow so that we may have full assurance of being able to complete consideration of the bill? We have been meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not on the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. But we have been meeting at 11 o'clock for the consideration of other bills not as pressing as the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have made some commitments to Senators who are absent from the floor at this time that, insofar as I was concerned, I should be willing to have the Senate meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock. Probably those Senators have relied upon that assurance in making their arrangements to return to the city.

On my part, I prefer to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, Mr. President, if the Senator has made commitments, that is a different matter. But, for my part, I should be glad to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. RUSSELL. The suggestion to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. was made only in the last few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that

the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the God of our fathers, be near us when we call and answer us when we pray, and when Thou hearest, forgive. There are truths that he who runs may read; there are deeper truths which come only to those who wait and meditate in Thy holy presence. Unfold these, we pray, that we may feel Thy sacred nearness and be led by the fullness of Thy wisdom. In the secret of Thy fellowship, in the depths of soul, preserve us from idle reverie, from the spirit of petulance, from superficial judgment and from the gnawing fragments of self-pity.

We praise Thee for the strength of the life of faith. O may the great crises of today serve to bind us to something beyond the vain, empty repetitions of this world. Dear Lord, give us courage to identify ourselves with every cause of human need, where sorrow cannot wholly rise, whatever the denial or honor it may involve. Fill us with the understanding that the world belongs to him who wills, who knows and prays, trustfully walking with Thee whose ways are paths of peace. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) entitled "An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the

joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department:

Department of Agriculture.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. O'NEAL, HENDRICKS, GORE, KIRWAN, JOHNSON of Indiana, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and PLOESER.

WOMEN LAWMAKERS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article by John O'Donnell in the Times-Herald of June 9, under the caption "Capitol Stuff," in which he quotes a "lady lawmaker." An anonymous statement or letter is always the resort of a coward.

As dean of the women in Congress, I resent this filthy article and believe it to be an unwarranted, contemptible, cowardly attack on all women lawmakers and other women as well. My colleagues in the House are representative of the highest type of womanhood. I know none would author the statement quoted in the article referred to. Nor do I believe Mrs. Hobby would be a party to what is described as a "super secret agreement," reached by the high ranking officers of the War Department. The loose talk that has been indulged in recently concerning our women in the armed service can be nothing less than Nazi-inspired propaganda to frighten the mothers and relatives of young women who have volunteered and those who are considering service in the armed forces.

The issue is not, as he describes it, one of "religion, honor, politics, and medicine," but of decency and morality. I know a great many exceptionally fine, highly qualified young girls serving in difficult positions in the Army, Navy, and marines who could be enjoying every comfort at home had they been less patriotic and more selfish. I know the attacks that have been made on them will be resented by every fair-minded person from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. O'Donnell is doing a great disservice to our country by writing such stuff. If he cannot put on a uniform and serve his country, he should not slander those